

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

JUN 4 1928

Volume XLIII

JUNE, 1928

Number 6

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

W. KURRELMEYER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
RAYMOND, W. O.—New Light on the Genesis of 'The Ring and the Book,'	357
NETHERCOT, A. H.—The Letters of Abraham Cowley,	369
RAYSOR, T. M.—Two Unpublished Letters by Coleridge in Contemporary Newspapers,	375
DOUGLAS, T. W.—What is the 'Parlement of Foules?'	378
KURRELMEYER, W.—Eine Unbekannte Klopstock-Originalausgabe,	384
NOYES, R. G.—Mrs. Bracegirdle's Acting in Crown's 'Justice Busy',	390
NOCK, S. A.—Notes on Milton's Appearance,	391
GOHDES, C.—A Note on the Bibliography of Keats,	393

REVIEWS:—

W. E. PECK, Shelley, His Life and Work. [A. Koszul.]	394
H. A. WHITE, Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage; J. H. CASKEY, The Life and Works of Edward Moore; HAZELTON SPENCER, Shakespeare Improved. [Allardyce Nicoll.]	399
J. W. CUNLIFFE, Modern English Playwrights. [J. E. Uhler.]	402
H. J. SMITH, Oliver Goldsmith's <i>The Citizen of the World</i> ; R. S. CRANE, New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith. [K. C. Balderston.]	403
KATHERINE C. BALDERSTON, The History and Sources of Percy's <i>Memoir of Goldsmith</i> . [S. B. Hustvedt.]	405
E. PONS, Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne. [K. Malone.]	406
E. ERMATINGER, Barock und Rokoko in der deutschen Dichtung. [E. Feise.]	408
T. R. PALFREY, <i>L'Europe littéraire</i> (1833-1834). [A. Schaffer.]	409
ARISTIDE MARIE, Bibliographie des œuvres de Gérard de Nerval. [M. Rudwin.]	411
P. H. REANEY, A Grammar of the Dialect of Penrith. [G. K. Flom.]	412
Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800. [E. Bernbaum.]	416
J. L. LOWES, The Road to Xanadu. [Alice D. Snyder.]	426

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Seventy-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,
and Raymond D. Havens

ADVISORY EDITORS

D. S. Blondheim, G. Chinard, E. Feise, J. C. French, E. Greenlaw,
K. Malone, J. Robles, R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other
countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN STUDIES

New Studies now ready for distribution include

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

- No. 24. William Wordsworth—His Doctrine and Art in their Historical Relations. By Arthur Beatty. Revised Edition. 810 pp. Paper, \$2.00

SCIENCE

- No. 4. The Optic and Microscopic Characters of Artificial Minerals. By Alexander N. Winchell. A thorough treatment of the artificial minerals giving their chemical names and composition, crystal system, physical characteristics, optic properties, inversions, and synthesis. 215 pp. Paper, \$1.50

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HISTORY

- No. 12. Miracula Sanctae Virginis Mariae. A hitherto unpublished twelfth century MS. from the library of the University of Chicago, edited with preface by Elise F. Dexter. 61 pp. Paper, \$1.00

- No. 13. The History of the Byzantine Empire. By A. A. Vasiliev. Volume I of this history is now ready. 453 pp. Paper, \$3.00

Published 1927

- The Mysticism of William Blake. By Helen C. White. Language and Literature No. 23. 276 pp. Paper, \$2.50

In Preparation

- The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage, 1700-1800. By S. A. Leonard. Language and Literature No. 25. Ready September 1928.
Goethe's Lyric Poems in Translation after 1860. By Stella M. Hinz. Language and Literature No. 26. Ready November 1928.

Orders with remittance payable to G. L. Gilbert, Bursar, will be received by the University Editor, 701 Langdon Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

Write for a complete list of publications

the
land.
kins



Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

JUNE, 1928

Number 6

NEW LIGHT ON THE GENESIS OF *THE RING AND THE BOOK*

The date of Browning's first reference, in writing, to the story of *The Ring and the Book*, has generally been regarded as determined by a letter of his to Miss Isa Blagden, cited by Mrs. Orr, in part as follows:

Biarritz, Maison Gastonbide: Sept. 19, '62.

. . . I stayed a month at green pleasant little Cambo, and then came here from pure inability to go elsewhere—St.-Jean-de-Luz, on which I had reckoned, being still fuller of Spaniards who profit by the new railway. . . . I stay till the end of the month, then go to Paris, and then get my neck back into the old collar again. Pen has managed to get more enjoyment out of his holiday than seemed at first likely. . . . For me, I have got on by having a great read at Euripides—the one book I brought with me, besides attending to my own matters, my new poem that is about to be; and of which the whole is pretty well in my head,—the Roman murder story you know. . . .¹

This letter, as printed by Mrs. Orr, appears to fix the date of Browning's first literary allusion to the story of *The Ring and the Book* as Sept. 19, 1862. It also seems to confirm the accuracy of her account of the poet's holiday trips to France—his stay at Cambo and Biarritz in 1862 and his initial visit to Pornic, Brittany, in 1863.

So far as I have knowledge, the validity of the date prefixed to the Isa Blagden letter, and the correctness of Mrs. Orr's chronology with respect to Browning's residences in France in 1862 and 1863,

¹ Mrs. Sutherland Orr, *Life and Letters of Robert Browning*, Rev. Ed., London, 1908, p. 250.

have never been questioned. On the contrary, all of his biographers cite the Biarritz letter to Miss Blagden as indisputable proof that the poet was occupied with the theme of *The Ring and the Book* in 1862, and that he was in the neighbourhood of the Pyrenees in the summer and early autumn of this year.

Yet, notwithstanding this unanimity of statement, there exists definite circumstantial evidence that Browning was not at Cambo and Biarritz in 1862, and that the letter which Mrs. Orr quotes is misdated by two years.

In the *Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, published in 1923 at the Baylor University Press and edited by Professor A. J. Armstrong, there are two letters of the poet written at Ste. Marie près Pornic, on August 18 and September 19 of the year 1862.² It is of particular note that the date of the second Pornic letter, Sept. 19, 1862, and the date of the Biarritz letter as printed by Mrs. Orr, are identical, and that both letters are addressed to Miss Blagden. Obviously, Browning cannot have written to Isa Blagden from Brittany and the Pyrenees on the same day, and, consequently, one of these letters must be misdated. But, while the date of the Biarritz letter, as cited by Mrs. Orr, is unconfirmed by other testimony, the evidence that the poet was at Pornic in 1862 comes from a variety of sources and is of positive character.

The confusion in which Mrs. Orr is involved through her acceptance of the date of the Biarritz letter as Sept. 19, 1862, is shown by the fact that it compels her to regard 1863 as the year of Browning's initial stay at Pornic. She apparently substantiates this by an extract from another letter of the poet's to Isa Blagden, in which he describes his first summer spent in the vicinity of Pornic as follows:

... This is a wild little place in Brittany, something like that village where we stayed last year. Close to the sea—a hamlet of a dozen houses, perfectly lonely—one may walk on the edge of the low rocks by the sea for miles.³

Though Mrs. Orr does not print the heading of this letter, she tells us that it was written on August 18, 1863. This fits in with her belief that Browning was at Cambo and Biarritz, and not in

² Pp. 59-67.

³ Mrs. Orr, *ut supra*, p. 256.

Brittany, during the summer of 1862. But a reference to the superscription and full text of this particular letter, as published in the *Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, shows that the correct date is 1862 not 1863.⁴ The heading there reads: "Chez M. La Raison, Maire de St. Marie, Pornic, Aug. 18, '62."

If Mrs. Orr's dates were accurate, the "village where we stayed last year" would be "green pleasant little Cambo," an inland hamlet; which would scarcely justify the comparison to Ste. Marie, "a wild little place in Brittany." The allusion is plainly to St. Enogat, near Dinard, another Breton village, where Browning spent a vacation of two months in 1861.

The two long Ste. Marie letters of August 18 and September 19 would, of themselves, be sufficient to establish the fact of the poet's residence at Pornic in 1862. They supplement each other and give a circumstantial and somewhat detailed account of his interests and diversions in Brittany.⁵ From these and a preceding letter from Warwick Crescent, we can definitely trace Browning's itinerary, in France, throughout the months of August and September, 1862. He left London for Paris on August 2, arrived at Pornic before the 18th, remained there till the end of September, and then, after a week in Paris, returned to London. Further evidence of Browning's stay at Pornic in this year is provided by subsequent letters to Miss Blagden. Writing to her from Warwick Crescent, London, on Oct. 18, '62, he speaks of the physical benefit derived from his summer in Brittany:

You suppose I was dull at Ste. Marie. On the contrary I stayed a week longer than the allotted time, and could have done well there for

⁴ Pp. 59-62.

⁵ Abbé J. Dominique, in *Le Poète Browning à Sainte-Marie-De-Pornic*, has preserved several reminiscences of old inhabitants concerning his stay in this Breton village. Since these traditions were collected by the Abbé during a visit to the neighbourhood around the time of the publication of his article in Nov. 1899, they have no bearing on the dates of the poet's residences in Brittany. In placing Browning at Pornic in 1863, 1864, and 1865, it is clear that Abbé Dominique is simply following Mrs. Orr's account. For example, he cites, from Mrs. Orr's *Life*, the letter in which the poet describes his first arrival at Ste. Marie, and accepts the date of 1863 she assigns to it. But the correct date, as the *Letters of Browning to Isa Blagden* prove, is Aug. 18, 1862.

ever: it was in my scheme to read, walk & do nothing but think there; . . . My health is much improved I should tell you, for I was regularly ill when I left town."

Again, in a Ste. Marie letter of August 19, 1863, telling Miss Blagden of his second arrival at Pornic, he writes of having "left on the 9th for Tours, thence, next day to Nantes and this old place, where I find nothing altered." ⁷

The testimony of these various "Blagden" letters is conclusive, but a final proof of the poet's residence in Brittany in 1862 may be cited from an independent source. In a letter to the American sculptor, W. W. Story and his family, dated from Ste. Marie, près Pornic, Brittany, Sept. 5th, 1863, Browning writes: "Here are we in the old place, just as we left it last year, and I rather like it better on acquaintance." ⁸

The evidence that Browning was at Pornic on Sept. 19, 1862, proves that the Biarritz letter with its allusion to the Roman murder story, as quoted by Mrs. Orr, is wrongly dated. This, however, is a purely negative result. Is it possible to establish with certainty, the true date of the letter in question? I feel convinced that this can be done beyond any reasonable doubt.

There is, in the first place, indisputable evidence to show that Browning paid a visit to Cambo and Biarritz in the year 1864. As a matter of fact this has been recognized by Edward Dowden and W. Hall Griffin in their admirable biographies of the poet. Deriving his information from letters written in 1864 by Browning to Mrs. Story and Francis Palgrave, which contain references to this particular trip, Professor Dowden notes: "In 1864 Browning again 'braved the awful Biarritz' and stayed at Cambo. On this occasion he visited Fontarabia." ⁹ Professor Griffin also alludes to an 1864 letter from Browning to Tennyson, and records his itinerary in Southern France with a little more detail.

When the second sojourn at Sainte Marie ended, he had a fancy to see what Arcachon was like. Finding it noisy and modern, he and his party pushed on to St. Jean-de-Luz, and thence, there being no accomoda-

⁷ Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden, p. 71.

⁸ Ibid., p. 94.

⁹ Henry James, William Wetmore Story and His Friends, II, 138.

⁹ Edward Dowden, The Life of Robert Browning (Everyman's Library), p. 230 n.

tion, to Cambo once more. From this village he visited the *pas de Roland*, which, as letters to Story and to Tennyson testify, impressed him greatly.¹⁰

Yet, while fully aware that Browning went to the Basses-Pyrénées in 1864, Dowden and Griffin fall into the error of accepting the date giving by Mrs. Orr for the Biarritz letter of 1862. Consequently they regard the poet's visit to the Basque region of France in 1864 as his second stay at Cambo and Biarritz, the first being in 1862. They, also, in common with other biographers and literary critics, follow Mrs. Orr in her erroneous statement that the first summer spent by Browning at Pornic was in 1863.

As has been shown, the Ste. Marie letters to Isa Blagden in 1862-63 furnish decisive proof that the poet was in Brittany during the months of August and September 1862, and that the date printed by Mrs. Orr for the Biarritz letter, Sept. 19, '62, is untenable. But, apart from the Pornic letters, a careful reading of the accounts given by Browning of his vacation in the south of France in 1864, reveals the fact that he is visiting the Pyrenees for the first time. Here, too, valuable supplementary information is available through the publication of *The Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*. Fortunately the comparison of the letters we now possess does more than disprove the 1862 date of the Biarritz letter. It shows that the latter was written shortly after letters of Browning from Cambo to Mrs. Story in August 1864 and deals with the same trip to the Pyrenees. It enables us to fix the date of the Biarritz letter, with assurance, as September 19, 1864, instead of September 19, 1862.

At this point I cite, in chronological order, extracts from Browning's correspondence, descriptive of his visit to the Pyrenees in 1864, which have a bearing on the date of the Biarritz letter. The first citation is from a letter to Isa Blagden.

Aug. 19, '64.
Cambo près Bayonne,
Basses Pyrénées.

Dearest Isa,

You will wonder to find me so far South: we had a fancy to go to Arcachon, a newish place by Bordeaux, but found it crammed with strangers: we tried St. Jean de Luz and Biarritz to no better purpose,

¹⁰ W. Hall Griffin, *The Life of Robert Browning*, London, 1910, p. 235.

and having to make the best of a mistake, settled ourselves in this pleasant little place for a month, meaning to get two or three weeks of sea-bathing at St. Jean (as charming as Biarritz is ugly). . . . Pen amuses himself very well, having a knack that way. . . . I shall be able to spin the month out. . . .¹¹

The second extract is from a letter, written at Cambo, addressed to Mrs. Story, the wife of the American sculptor. This is undated. A comparison, however, with the letter just quoted, shows that it also was written in August 1864.

Cambo, près Bayonne, Basses Pyrénées.

. . . We had a fancy to try a new place, Arcachon by Bordeaux, and reached it in two day's easy journeying only to find what was a few years ago a beautiful pine-forest turned into a toy-town . . . and the whole full to the edge of strangers . . . we determined to go on to Bayonne, and did so, hoping for rest to the foot-sole at St-Jean-de-Luz. This is really an exquisite little place, with a delicious sea, and great mountains in the background; (but with) every house taken, every one of not a few. Last we braved the awful Biarritz, but liked the noise and crowd of it still less than Arcachon. . . . There seemed no course open to us—pushed up at the very end of France as we were—but to lie by in some quiet place till the bathers should begin to leave St-Jean; they never stay long, in France, but come and go in a crowd. So here we are at Cambo, a village in the Pyrénées fifteen or sixteen miles from Bayonne. . . . I went two days ago to see a famous mountain-pass, *le pas de Roland*, so called because that paladin kicked a hole in a rock, which blocked the way, to allow Charlemagne's army to pass. . . . Well, our plan is to stay here three weeks longer, till the 13th, and then spend the rest of our holiday at St-Jean—say three weeks, bathing assiduously to make up for lost time. . . . I hold for my original scheme till forced to strike my flag. Be where we may return to Paris in the first week of October. . . .¹²

The third citation is from a letter of Browning's to Tennyson acknowledging the receipt of a copy of the "Enoch Arden" volume.

19 Warwick Crescent,
Oct. 13th, 1864.

Dear Tennyson,

I have been two months away, and only just find your book now. . . .

¹¹ This letter is printed, in full, in *The Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, pp. 103-105.

¹² This letter is printed, in full, by Henry James in *William Wetmore Story and His Friends*, Edinburgh and London, 1903, II, 153-156.

"Boadicea," the new metre, is admirable, a paladin's achievement in its way. I am thinking of Roland's Pass in the Pyrenees, where he hollowed a rock that had hitherto blocked the road, by one kick of his boot. . . . Give my congratulations to Mrs. Tennyson. I looked a long look three days ago at the Hotel de Douvres, where I met her first; and of you I was thinking particularly at Amiens station next afternoon. . . .¹³

A note to Francis Palgrave, written a few days after the letter to Tennyson, contains a brief mention of Browning's visit to the Basque country.

19 Warwick Crescent: Oct. 19, 1864.

My dear Palgrave,—Thank you indeed for your letter and the pleasant news of your return. We were not near each other in France—I went southward to the Pyrenees and Biarritz—indeed, I saw Fontarabia and St. Sebastian. . . .¹⁴

Through a comparison of these various sources of information, we may trace Browning's route in the south of France during August and September 1864, with precision. In the opening lines of his letter to Mrs. Story, Browning writes of reaching Arcachon by Bordeaux "in two days easy journeying." After a couple of days there, he and his party go on to Bayonne with the intention of staying at St.-Jean-de-Luz, a seaside resort twelve miles to the south-west of that town. Finding every house taken at St.-Jean, they try Biarritz, five miles west-south-west of Bayonne, but are repelled by the noise, crowd, and high prices. From Biarritz they proceed to Cambo, "a village in the Pyrenees fifteen or sixteen miles from Bayonne." While the date of Browning's sojourn at Cambo is not indicated in his letter to Mrs. Story, this is supplied by his letter to Miss Blagden of Aug. 19, '64, from the same place. The likeness between these two letters is so close, extending even to parallel phrasing, that they were evidently composed at the same time, or within one or two days of each other. The letter to Miss Blagden, like that to Mrs. Story, begins with an account of Browning's journey from Arcachon to Cambo via St.-Jean-de-Luz and Biarritz. While it is impossible to tell the exact date of his arrival at Cambo, these letters, one of which is headed Aug. '19,

¹³ Cited from *Alfred Lord Tennyson, A Memoir by his Son*, New York, 1911, II, 16.

¹⁴ From a letter printed by G. F. Palgrave in *Francis Turner Palgrave*, London, 1899, pp. 94-95.

were undoubtedly written in the early part of his residence there. Both in the Blagden and Story letters there are descriptions which make it plain that the poet was visiting this region for the first time in 1864. With Florence in mind, he writes to Miss Blagden:

It is very saddening to me to feel the Southern influence again: the mountains under which we are, are just like the Tuscan ranges: the verdure and vegetation more flourishing and abundant, and the villages less picturesquely distributed by far: but there are *cicale* on the trees, and much the same blue sky as of old: few vines, but great fields of maize, and plenty of fern and heather. No, it is not anything near Italy after all but dearer for what it is like.¹⁶

This is a definite statement that the trip to the Pyrenees was Browning's first visit to the South since he had left Italy in 1861.

In similar vein, describing a region that is new to him, he tells Mrs. Story:

The country is exceedingly beautiful, the mountains just like the Tuscan ranges, with plenty of oak and chestnut trees, and everywhere the greenest of meadows—the great characteristic of the place. The little fresh river that winds in and out of the hills and vales, the Nive, comes from Spain, which is three hours' walk off. This is the Basque country, moreover, the people talk French with difficulty, and charming girl-faces abound.¹⁸

Again, in writing to Mrs. Story, he contrasts his first impression of Cambo in 1864, with his memories of Ste. Marie in the two preceding years, as follows:

... for the last two years in the dear rough old Ste. Marie, stark-naked as she was of all comfort to the British mind, put this smug little village in unpleasant relief. I don't see the sea all day long.¹⁷

In the Biarritz letter, cited by Mrs. Orr, Browning declared, "I stayed a month at green pleasant little Cambo." This corresponds exactly with the period indicated by the Cambo letters to Miss Blagden and Mrs. Story of August 1864. For instance, when writing to Isa Blagden on the nineteenth, he tells her that he and his party have "settled" themselves "in this pleasant little place for a month," and adds "I shall be able to spin the month

¹⁶ *Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, p. 104.

¹⁸ William Wetmore Story and His Friends, II, 154.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

out." To establish the precise date of the Biarritz letter, it is of particular importance to note Browning's mention of his future movements in the Cambo letters. In coming to Cambo the poet had made a virtue of necessity, not being able to find accomodation at either of the popular French watering places, St.-Jean-de-Luz or Biarritz. As he writes to Mrs. Story: "There seemed no course open to us—pushed up at the very end of France as we were—but to lie by in some quiet place till the bathers should begin to leave St.-Jean." Browning's intention was, therefore, to return to St.-Jean-de-Luz later on in the season. He gives Mrs. Story the following definite information on this point: "Well, our plan is to stay here three weeks longer, till the 13th, and then spend the rest of our holiday at St.-Jean, say three weeks, bathing assiduously to make up for lost time."¹⁸ The parallel reference, in the Blagden letter of Aug. 19, '64, tells of his purpose "to get two or three weeks of sea-bathing at St.-Jean" after the month's stay at Cambo. Browning's plan was, then, to leave Cambo for St.-Jean-de-Luz, on the 13th of September; spend about three weeks of bathing there; and, as we learn from a later allusion in the Story letter, "return to Paris in the first week of October."

One alteration in this plan must be accounted for. If the letter of Sept. 19, cited by Mrs. Orr, should be dated 1864, how is it that we find the poet, not at St.-Jean, but at the neighbouring town of Biarritz? The reason is explained by Browning, himself, in the opening lines of the letter: ". . . I stayed a month at green pleasant little Cambo, and then came here from inability to go elsewhere—St.-Jean de Luz, on which I had reckoned, being still fuller of Spaniards who profit by the new railway."¹⁹

This Biarritz letter to Miss Blagden, when given its proper date of Sept. 19, 1864, fits in precisely with our knowledge of Browning's intended schedule derived from the Cambo letters of the previous month. It fills in the gap between his departure from Cambo on the 13th of September and his arrival at Paris about the beginning of October. His statement in this letter, "I stay till the end of the month, then go to Paris, and then get my neck back into the old collar again," corresponds with his purpose, as he wrote to Mrs. Story, to return to Paris in the first

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

¹⁹ Mrs. Orr, *Life*, p. 250.

week of October. Browning was back in London by the 13th of October. His letters from Warwick Crescent of the 13th and the 19th to Tennyson and Palgrave, respectively, contain interesting reminiscences of his vacation in the Pyrenees. They also give a little additional information concerning the closing incidents of his holiday in 1864. In his letter of October 13, he tells Tennyson that he "looked a long look three days ago at the Hotel de Douvres" and was "at Amiens station next afternoon." He was, therefore, still in France on the 10th and 11th of the month, having, in all probability, spent several days in Paris.

The correct dating of the Biarritz letter as 1864, not 1862, harmonizes the allusion to the Roman murder story with facts already ascertained regarding the genesis of *The Ring and the Book*. Browning speaks in this letter as if his "new poem that is about to be" were very much in the forefront of his thoughts. The whole of it, he informs Miss Blagden, is pretty well in his head. This points to a time when he seriously addressed himself to the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. Though "the Yellow Book" was discovered at Florence in June 1860, there is evidence to prove that it was not until 1864 that Browning threw his energies into the writing of the poem. In his apostrophe to the Yellow Book at the close of *The Ring and the Book* (xii, 227-8) he exclaims:

How will it be, my four-years'-intimate,
When thou and I part company anon?

As these lines were, in all likelihood, written shortly before the publication of the poem in the winter of 1868-9, they carry us back to the latter part of the year 1864 as the time when Browning definitely began the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. Other sources of information reveal that it was in the late summer and autumn of 1864 that the plan of *The Ring and the Book* took shape in the poet's mind. From the point of view of the date of the Biarritz letter with its allusion to the Roman murder story, the most noteworthy of these references is an entry in W. M. Rossetti's diary of March 15, 1868, which he made immediately after a visit from Browning. Here, on the authority of his talk with the poet, Rossetti directly connects the genesis of *The Ring and the Book* with the Basses-Pyrénées trip of 1864. He notes:

. . . Browning's forthcoming poem exceeds 20,000 lines: it may probably be out in July, but he would defer it if he finds that more conducive to the satisfactory completion of the work. He began it in October '64. Was staying at Bayonne, and walked out to a mountain-gorge traditionally said to have been cut or kicked out by Roland, and there laid out the full plan of his twelve cantos, accurately carried out in the execution.²⁰

The fidelity of this report is attested by comparing it with similar accounts of Browning's visit to Fontarabia in letters to Tennyson and Mrs. Story in 1864. He tells Tennyson: "I am thinking of Roland's Pass in the Pyrenees, where he hollowed a rock that had hitherto blocked the road, by one kick of his boot."²¹ In like manner he writes to Mrs. Story: "I went two days ago to see a famous mountain-pass, *le pas de Roland*, so called because that paladin kicked a hole in a rock, which blocked the way, to allow Charlemagne's army to pass."²² The passage in the letter to Mrs. Story shows, however, that the visit to *le pas de Roland* was not made from Bayonne in October, as Rossetti recalls it, but from the neighbouring village of Cambo, about the twentieth of August. Browning's recollection that he laid out the full plan of his twelve cantos of *The Ring and the Book* at Fontarabia is, therefore, in perfect accord with his statement to Miss Blagden regarding the Roman murder story, in his Biarritz letter of September 19. Here, writing about a month after his expedition to the mountain-gorge immortalized by Roland, he tells her that the whole of his prospective poem is pretty well in his head.²³ When the poet returned to London, at the close of his trip to the Pyrenees, he was still absorbed in the subject matter of *The Ring and the Book*. In the postscript of a letter to Frederic Leighton, written on Oct. 17, 1864, he asks the painter to furnish him with certain details regarding the church of San Lorenzo in Lucina.²⁴ These, he says, will be of great use to him. This

²⁰ Rossetti Papers, p. 302.

²¹ Tennyson, a Memoir, II, 16.

²² William Wetmore Story and His Friends, II, 154-5.

²³ Professor C. H. Herford has sensed the fact that the laying out of the plan of *The Ring and the Book* at Roland's Pass and Browning's mention of the Roman murder story in the Biarritz letter, are closely related in time. It is not, however, Rossetti's reminiscence, as Professor Herford conjectures, but the Biarritz letter that is misdated.

²⁴ Mrs. Orr, Life, p. 273.

church was the scene of Pompilia's marriage and also of the exposure of the bodies of the Comparini. The information supplied by Lord Leighton was subsequently made use of in Book II of *The Ring and the Book*.

The restoration of the correct date of the Biarritz letter, Sept. 19, '64, sets the allusion to the Roman murder story, with exactitude, in its proper context. After Browning's hands were freed by the publication of *Dramatis Personæ* in June 1864, he turned with zest to his new poetic venture. Standing beside the historic pass of Roland, in the latter part of August, his imagination received a fillip and "the full plan" of the twelve cantos of *The Ring and the Book* was actually conceived. With his mind still full of the subject he writes to Miss Blagden from Biarritz on Sept. 19:

For me, I have got on by having a great read at Euripides—the one book I brought with me, besides attending to my own matters, my new poem that is about to be; and of which the whole is pretty well in my head,—the Roman murder story you know.²⁵

The letter to Frederic Leighton, written on Oct. 17, shows his anxiety to secure information on particular details and his unabated interest in the theme of *The Ring and the Book*.

Were no fresh information available, the correction in the date of the Biarritz letter would widen the gap between the discovery of the Yellow Book and the first known reference of Browning, in writing, to the story of *The Ring and the Book*, by a space of two years. It would extend from 1860 to 1864 instead of from 1860 to 1862. The alteration in the date of the letter does, of course, transfer this particular mention of the Roman murder story from 1862 to 1864 and, up to the present, it has been regarded as the first literary allusion of its kind. There is, however, an earlier, though hitherto unnoticed, reference to the genesis of *The Ring and the Book* of an interesting and important character. With this I shall deal in a subsequent article.

WILLIAM O. RAYMOND.

University of Michigan.

²⁵ Mrs. Orr, *Life*, p. 250.

THE LETTERS OF ABRAHAM COWLEY

One of the minor literary mysteries of the seventeenth century has to do with Abraham Cowley's "Letters to his private Friends," of which, as his literary executor, Sprat, then went on to say, "the greatest Collection" belonged to himself and Martin Clifford.¹ And yet, because of scruples quite incomprehensible to the thoroughly modern mind, in his edition of Cowley the future Bishop of Rochester suppressed these letters, for the following reasons, which form an interesting commentary on the attitude toward letter-writing and letter-printing during the Restoration:

But I know you [Clifford] agree with me, that nothing of this Nature should be publish'd: And herein you have always consented to approve of the modest Judgment of our Country-men above the practice of some of our Neighbours, and chiefly of the *French*. I make no manner of question but the *English* at this time are infinitely improv'd in this way above the skill of former Ages, nay, of all Countries round about us that pretend to greater Eloquence. Yet they have been always judiciously sparing in Printing such composures, while some other Witty Nations have tyr'd all their Presses and Readers with them. The truth is, the Letters that pass between particular Friends, if they are written as they ought to be, can scarce ever be fit to see the light. They should not consist of fulsom Complements, or tedious Politicks, or elaborate Elegancies, or general Fancies. But they should have a Native clearness and shortness, a Domestical plaines, and a peculiar kind of Familiarity; which can only affect the humour of those to whom they were intended. . . . In such Letters the Souls of Men should appear undress'd; And in that negligent habit they may be fit to be seen by one or two in a Chamber, but not to go abroad into the streets.²

Accordingly, although Cowley's young Boswell extolled the letters of his Dr. Johnson in high and dignified terms for their "Native tenderness and Innocent gayety of . . . Mind," the letters disappeared, and have never since been found. Though that darling of the Victorians, Miss Mitford, scolded Sprat severely as a "Goth and a Vandal"; though Coleridge called him a prude; though such widely diversified critics as the *Critical Review*, in 1775, and Rich-

¹ Thomas Sprat, "An Account of the Life and Writings of Mr. Abraham Cowley," in J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1908), II, 137.

² *Ibid.*, p. 137.

ard Aldington, in 1921, lamented the loss; though Grosart in preparing his edition of Cowley searched everywhere diligently³—the letters are still missing, and bid fair to remain so. Several interesting and amusing attempts, however, have been made to supply the deficiency, as in the burlesque "Letter from Mr. Abraham Cowley to the Covent-Garden Society" in 1702,⁴ or in the more ambitious endeavor of *Fraser's Magazine* in 1836 to hoax the public into believing that the letters had actually been found in the possession of "a descendant of Dr. Spratt" and that the three letters which it printed were genuine specimens of Cowley's epistolary powers. But these forgeries would not deceive even a graduate student.⁵

Yet some of Cowley's genuine letters have been preserved—and more than students seem to realize. This ignorance is well illustrated by A. A. Tilley's reference in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* to the "one letter of this sort which has escaped destruction."⁶ Yet a census of all the letters known to the various writers on Cowley in the last century reveals the fact that four, and perhaps six, of his familiar epistles have been put into print, not to mention a hitherto unnoticed familiar element in certain

³ See, respectively, Mary Russell Mitford, *Recollections of a Literary Life* (London, 1852), I, 65; Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria* (Oxford, 1907), I, 44; *Crit. Rev.*, XXXIX (1775), 460; Aldington, "Cowley and the French Epicureans," *New Statesman*, XVIII (1921), 133; and Alexander Grosart, *The Complete Works of Abraham Cowley* (Edinburgh, 1881).

⁴ See Thomas Brown, *Works* (London, 1730), II, 125-126.

⁵ "The Familiar Letters of Cowley . . .," *Fraser's Magazine*, XIII (1836), 395-409; XIV (1836), 234-241. The contents and probable authorship of these letters are discussed by J. M. McBryde, *A Study of Cowley's Davideis* (Johns Hopkins dissertation, reprinted from *Journal of Germanic Philology*, II, 454-527), pp. 6-14.

⁶ Tilley, "The Essay and the Beginning of Modern English Prose," *Camb. Hist.* (N. Y., 1912), VIII, 433. By "this sort" Tilley excludes the series of political letters which Cowley wrote while he was in France and which were printed in 1702 as part of Tom Browne's *Miscellanea Aulica*. Grosart reprinted them in 1881. A. B. Gough, in his edition of Cowley's *Essays and Other Prose Writings* (Oxford, 1915), gives none of the letters. His note (p. xxix) refers only to *Miscellanea Aulica* and the same letter that Tilley knew, although he seems to have heard of others surviving (p. 340). William Stebbing, *Some Verdicts of History Reviewed* (London, 1887), pp. 72, 77, refers to most of them.

business or diplomatic correspondence which he conducted for the Royalists in France.

The only generally known letter of Cowley's is the one which somehow escaped from Dr. Sprat's drawer in spite of his precautions, and which Dr. Johnson has pickled for posterity in the rather bitter brine of his *Lives of the Poets*.⁷ This remnant of the correspondence between the two friends, humorously describing Cowley's not very auspicious arrival at Chertsey in April or May of 1665, was, as Johnson says, "accidentally preserved by Peck," but no other critic seems to have investigated the circumstances of the preservation. Peck himself, however, states that the letter was "Communicated by William Cowper, Esq; Clerk of the Parliaments," and that it was endorsed, "seemingly by a lady's hand," as "Mr. Abraham Cowley's Letter to Dr. Sprat, now Bp. of Rochester, written with his own hand."⁸ This William Cowper was the uncle of William Cowper, the poet (himself an admirer of Cowley), and had furnished Peck with several of his antiquarian curiosities.

Next to Sprat, Sir John Evelyn was probably Cowley's most intimate friend at the end of his life. Two specimens of their quaintly formal correspondence remain, and each is both biographically and stylistically interesting. The first, dated May 13, 1667 (two and a half months before Cowley's death), is the poet's fairly well-known reply to Evelyn's request for an ode on the Royal Society—a task which, as it happened, he had already completed for Sprat's forthcoming history of the group.⁹ Another letter, however, is not so well known; in fact, it appears only in Isaac Disraeli's *Calamities and Quarrels of Authors*, first published in 1812. As Disraeli himself said, his "researches could never obtain more than one letter of Cowley's—it is but an elegant trifle—returning thanks to his friend Evelyn for some seeds and plants The original is in Astle's collection."¹⁰ The letter is dated from Barn Elms, the first of Cowley's places of "retirement," March 23, 1663.

⁷ Johnson, "Cowley," *Lives* (Oxford, 1905), I, 16-17.

⁸ A *Collection of Curious Historical Pieces*, pp. 81-82. This is the second part, separately paged, of William Peck's *Memoirs of the Life and Actions of Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1740).

⁹ See Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence* (London, 1879), III, 349-351; or Grosart, I, lxxvii-viii.

¹⁰ Isaac Disraeli, *The Calamities and Quarrels of Authors* (N. Y., 1868),

There is also extant a short note to the Reverend Dr. Richard Busby, who had become the famous and admired "whipping master" of Westminster School just after Cowley's graduation. John Nichols, who found it among Busby's papers, first communicated it to the *Gentleman's Magazine* for October, 1787, and later reprinted it in his *Illustrations*.¹¹ Nichols surmised that the letter had accompanied a present of Cowley's first two Latin poems on plants in 1662, although statements in the letter itself would indicate a slightly later date.

Cowley's letters from Paris, where he was a sort of secretary for Lord Jermyn and Queen Henrietta Maria, to Henry Bennet, later Earl of Arlington, have always been passed over, as being only of a political and diplomatic nature. These fourteen letters, besides the additional one, which Grosart unearthed in the British Museum,¹² nevertheless reveal a steadily growing personal element, particularly in the two dated November 18 and December 5, 1650. By this stage of the correspondence Cowley had become so familiar with Bennet that, after giving a detailed account of the latest news from Scotland and England, he could end with such sly humorous remarks as these: "My Lord gives you many thanks for your Treffles, and Mrs. Gardner for your care of her Beauty; the former I had some part in, the latter I am sure I never shall"; or "I have this Afternoon receiv'd yours of the 26th of November; your present to Mrs. Gardner, to Mrs. Gard [sic], and your Questions too upon it make her blush. Your Treffles were excellēt good, as I wrote you word before; as for the Piedmont Wine we are now such moderate Men, as to content our selves with that of the Rhine, in which I hope suddenly to drink your Health."

None of the nineteen authentic letters described so far, however, contradicts Sprat's theory about the privacy of the audience desirable for the ideal personal epistle. And yet there is one positive, yet seemingly unnoticed, proof that either Sprat himself

I, 57-58, n. This letter is called to the attention of modern readers by John Sparrow, in his edition of *The Mistress with Other Select Poems of Abraham Cowley* (London, 1926), p. xi.

¹¹ See *Gent. Mag.*, LVII (1787), 847; Nichols, *Illustrations* (London, 1817-58), IV, 385; or Grosart, I, xxiv.

¹² The fourteen, taken from *Miscellanea Aulica* (1702), as well as the fifteenth, dated January 8, 1648/9, are reprinted in Grosart, II, 344-353.

failed to harmonize his principles with his practice, or else that on this point he was not in agreement with his author, Cowley. For the tenth of Cowley's essays, after being entitled "The Danger of Procrastination," is further headed "*A Letter to Mr. S. L.*" And the essay is a letter, in spite of the fact that Budgell in the 379th *Spectator* has seemingly been the only person to recognize it even indirectly as such. An interchange of letters has obviously been in progress, for in his opening sentence Cowley refers to his correspondent's approval of "my design, of withdrawing my self from all the tumult and business of the world." Moreover, he quotes and refutes his friend's suggestion that it may nevertheless be advisable to postpone the actual retirement until the hoped-for reward for his services to the Royal party shall arrive. The friend's personality evolves still further when Cowley mentions their mutual love for Cicero, as well as their discussions as to whether the obscurity of Persius prevents him from being a good poet, and then finishes with two verse paraphrases of his correspondent's "special good Friend," Martial.

Who "Mr. S. L." was, however, cannot be categorically stated.¹³ His initials fit those of none of Cowley's known friends—with one possible exception. If the phrase had only omitted the "L." no one would hesitate in affirming that Sprat had clearly played the traitor to himself and printed one of his collection of letters. By his own admission, indeed, we know that he had remonstrated with Cowley about the latter's retirement, although seemingly in more positive terms than the letter would indicate.¹⁴ Moreover, the literary preferences alluded to would easily suit what is known of Sprat's disposition, even though an examination of his published works up to the time of Cowley's death fails to reveal any exact links. However, in Sprat's Latin life of Cowley prefixed to the *Poemata Latina* in 1668 occurs the phrase "vivendi aliquando in otio cum dignitate" in a description of Cowley's retirement.¹⁵ In the letter, the correspondent had written similarly, in advising Cowley to wait until, "according to the saying of that person

¹³ Gough, p. 361, says, "This person has not been identified."

¹⁴ Sprat, p. 141.

¹⁵ Sprat, "De Vita & Scriptis A. Couleii," *Poemata Latina* (Londini, 1678), n. p.

[Cicero] whom you and I love very much and would believe as soon as another man," he had got such an estate as would afford him "*Cum dignitate otium.*" Whether Sprat was quoting the essay or whether he was quoting himself cannot be decided, but with the other evidence the latter alternative seems the more probable.

But how explain the "L."? There is but one remote possibility. Sprat was prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral from 1660 to 1669. Perhaps "Mr. S. L." meant "Mr. Sprat of Lincoln." The suggestion may at least stand until a better is made.

In essay ten, then, we have one of Cowley's personal letters—perhaps addressed to Sprat. Who was responsible for putting it there for publication? Once more the evidence seems to point to Sprat, for, as Tilley has said,¹⁶ Cowley must have written his lines while he was still only contemplating retirement—that is, before 1663, when he is found at Barn Elms. This essay is therefore not only the earliest composed of the whole series of essays, but it also seems to be misplaced in the otherwise well-organized group.¹⁷ What Sprat's motives were in inserting such a letter in his collected edition may be only conjectured. Perhaps he put it in for the same reason as he did another essay, which may also be considered as a letter and which also does not fit snugly into the scheme of the rest of the series; *i. e.*, essay five, "The Garden," which is further labeled "*To J. Evelyn Esquire,*" and which was sent to the latter from Chertsey on August 16, 1666, after Evelyn had dedicated the second edition of his *Kalendarium Hortense* to Cowley in that year.¹⁸ Perhaps, therefore, Sprat simply wished to eke out the charming but scanty prose fragments left by his friend, knowing that this friend had planned to add to them himself, until death suddenly cut him off.¹⁹ But may one not think that the future Dean of Westminster and Bishop of Rochester was human enough not to have the resolution to suppress all the public evidence of his extreme intimacy with the famous man whom common consent

¹⁶ Tilley, p. 432.

¹⁷ See my forthcoming article, "Abraham Cowley's Essays," *J. E. G. P.*

¹⁸ See William Upcott, *The Miscellaneous Writings of John Evelyn* (London, 1825), pp. xvi, 442. The original MS. of Cowley's letter was given to Upcott by "the late Lady Evelyn" (p. 435) and he has reproduced its text.

¹⁹ Cf. Sprat, in Spingarn, II, 138.

TWO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS BY COLERIDGE 375

named the greatest poet of his day, and that he therefore took care to eternize himself among Cowley's essays under the innocent disguise of "Mr. S. L."?

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT.

Northwestern University.

TWO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS BY COLERIDGE IN CONTEMPORARY NEWSPAPERS

I.

While searching Bristol newspapers of 1813-14 for information bearing on Coleridge's lectures of that date, I happened to discover a little controversy between Coleridge and an anonymous writer, "Cosmo," over Coleridge's essays on the fine arts, which were first published¹ in *Felix Farley's Bristol Journal* during August and September, 1814. Cosmo's letters are not worth reprinting, and may be very briefly summarized. His first letter, to the editor of the *Bristol Gazette*, was published September 1, 1814. It was a serious and not discourteous argument against the value of metaphysical discussion of the arts, and against certain of Coleridge's theories. Unfortunately the author permitted himself a few touches of clumsy irony, which irritated Coleridge; and his naïvete and ignorance aroused Coleridge's contempt. The result was a violent answer in the form of a letter to the editor of *Felix Farley's Bristol Journal*, September 10. It cannot be said that Coleridge's letter, which is here reprinted for the first time, is much more deserving of being republished than the letters of Cosmo, except for the fact that it displays one aspect of Coleridge's character—not in this case, entirely admirable.

¹ Republished by Cottle in an appendix to *Early Recollections* (1837); by Thomas Ashe in the Bohn edition of Coleridge's *Miscellanies* (1885), p. 5 ff.; and finally, more accurately, by J. Shawcross, *Biographia Literaria* (1907), II, 219 ff.

All numbered notes in this article are my own; the only note by Coleridge himself is that attached to the first letter, which is marked by an asterisk.

TO THE EDITOR

Sir,

An ambitious Sign-painter * has been disturbed in stomach usque ad nauseam (eheu! quantum valet invida Bilis!) by my having presumed to elucidate a Principle of Painting by reference to the Works of a resident Artist,² whose genius has been accredited by far higher and more public testimonials than mine. He has in consequence discovered an intolerable deformity in my Essay on Beauty, nay, in the very introductory sentences, and presented me unasked with a sort of Caffrarian *Cosmetic* for its removal. Should any of your Readers be desirous to have the like made up for them, the following is the recipe:—*Stercoris anserini q. s. adipem anserino bene permissi. Fiat COSMIANUM.* Which last word Ainsworth cites from Martial and explains by “a sort of Pomatum of a rank scent made by one Cosmo.”

I return him thanks; but till he has acquired a knowledge enough not to mistake the Acanthus of the Corinthian for the Ramshorns of the Ionic Order; logic enough not to confound the genus with the species, and the species with the genus; modesty enough not to talk of books, which he never read, was never able to read, and probably never saw; (but why should I tire you with a detail of ignorances and misstatements, at least equal in number to that of his sentences?) in short, till this Nauseist of “mere mechanic ingenuity” shall have proved himself capable of writing three periods consecutively without some offence against either Grammar, Logic, History or good Manners; I must content myself by admonishing him, Nil, nisi lignum, oblinire; which may be interpreted, keep to thy own Ladder Friend! (on which Hogarth in his Beer Street has immortalized one of thy Predecessors) and pray Heaven to preserve thee from Envy, Hatred, Uncharitableness and all the vices, that might finally translate thee to a far less honourable one.

Aristotle, Mr. Editor! tells us, Cytharizando fit Cytharaedus. Si quis huic miserrimo (ipso quod habet extracto) aliud superimposuerit Cerebrum, forsitan Criticando fiet Criticus. There is no danger of Cosmo's suffering any pain from the preceding sentence, unless the School boy, who furnished his Letter to the Editor of the Gazette with the thousand times quoted quotation from Ovid, should be mischievous enough to construe it for him.

With sincere respect, I remain, dear Sir,

Your obliged,

S. T. COLERIDGE.

* Such I believe him to be, though by the exquisitely ludicrous Personification of Music, worthy of Holofernes! and by the no less exquisite blunder in the reason which he assigns for preferring this omniform “She”² of his, to her Sisters, Painting and Poetry, he would fain mislead us into supposing him a *Fidler*. But this I regard as a mere *ruse da guerre*.

¹ Allston.

² Music, which Cosmo personified in the most awkward manner.

TWO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS BY COLERIDGE 377

Cosmo responded defiantly in the *Gazette*, September 15, that Coleridge's Latin was "fit really for the walls of the Roman *cloaca maxima*." He again indulged in awkward sarcasm over individual phrases in Coleridge's essays and announced that his letters were "*To be continued if necessary.*" Coleridge probably was ashamed of such a controversy and became silent, but Cosmo broke into print again in the *Gazette*, September 29, with a final blast against his great antagonist.

II.

Much more interesting than the absurd controversy at Bristol are two letters⁴ from Coleridge and an anonymous 'S. T. C.', which were published in the *Courier* in 1810. On September 15, 1810, the *Courier* contained a letter to the editor accusing Scott of plagiarism from Home's *Douglas*, Ossian, Pope's *Windsor Forest*, Southey's *Madoc*, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, and the ballad of Johnnie Armstrong. In each case the writer cited parallel passages, but these need not be reprinted. The important fact was his signature, 'S. T. C.', perhaps maliciously chosen because of its identity with the signature frequently used by Coleridge, or perhaps the actual initials of the writer.

Fortunately, Southey saw the letter in the *Courier* and showed it to Coleridge, who disclaimed its authorship and declared that he would write to the *Courier* to correct all possibility of misunderstanding. Fearing that this intention might not be realized, Southey wrote himself directly to Scott, explaining what had happened.⁵ Southey's generous letter of friendship brought forth a kind and high-minded response from Scott, assuring Coleridge, through Southey, that his suspicions were entirely cleared away. Lockhart prints this characteristic letter,⁶ and explains the incident, but he evidently did not know that Coleridge was as good as his word and had immediately published his disclaimer in the *Courier*, September 20. The letter has not been republished and is worth preserving because of the epigrammatic conclusion, which is doubly interesting as coming from a writer who was himself to be repeatedly accused of plagiarism.

⁴I obtained the clue to these letters from a manuscript note by Mr. Ernest Hartley Coleridge.

⁵Southey's *Life and Correspondence* (1849), III, 291.

⁶*Life of Scott* (Philadelphia, 1839), II, 261.

WALTER SCOTT

In our Paper of the 15th inst. there appeared an article under the head of "Walter Scott," and with signature of S. T. C. As this is, and has often publicly appeared as the signature of MR. S. T. COLERIDGE, we feel it our duty, at his request, to declare that Mr. COLERIDGE is not the author—and would not have known even of the existence of the Paragraph, had it not been pointed out to him soon after the arrival of the COURIER at Keswick. Neither is Mr. COLERIDGE able to interpret the phrase 'guilty of imitation'; a sort of *guilt* in which every writer in prose or verse must of necessity be implicated, if we except HOMER, who is himself immaculately original only from the loss of all the writings anterior to the Iliad.

T. M. RAYSOR.

The Johns Hopkins University.

WHAT IS THE PARLEMENT OF FOULES?

Mr. Manly's objection to the whole theory that there are historical persons represented by the eagles in the *Parlement of Foules*,¹ and Miss Rickert's presentation of an entirely different set of historical persons from those of the earlier interpretations,² present an opening for a theory which may, in a way, combine the recent additions to knowledge on the subject and discard the disproved.

There are three theories held by those who think that there are historical persons represented by the eagles. All except Miss Rickert have centered upon Anne of Bohemia as the "formel egel". As to the three suitors, the earlier opinion, expressed by Koch,³ was that they represent Guillaume de Bavière, Friedrich of Meissen, and Richard II. The later view, proposed by Emerson,⁴ and upheld by Mr. Samuel Moore,⁵ is that the three suitors were Richard II, Friedrich of Meissen, and Charles VI. The theory proposed by Miss Rickert is that the formel egel is Phillipa, daughter of John of Gaunt, and that the three suitors are Richard II, William of Hainaut, and John of Blois. In preparation for proposing her

¹ *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, L (1913), 278-290.

² *Modern Philology*, XVIII (1920), 1-29.

³ *Englische Studien*, I, 287 ff.

⁴ *Modern Philology*, VIII (1910), 45-62.

⁵ *MLN.*, XXVI (1911), 8-12.

theory, Miss Rickert presented historical evidence which tends to show that Friedrich of Meissen and Charles VI were not suitors for the hand of Anne at the time when Richard II entered the field. Her argument against the Richard-Anne theory is triple: 1. It does not explain the divergence of the poem from the *demande d'amours* type. 2. It does not explain the satire in the poem. 3. It is not supported by historical evidence.

Mr. Manly's argument against the Richard-Anne theory is: 1. Lines 117-118 preclude the dating of the poem in 1381; but if it was written in 1382, after the marriage of Richard and Anne, the fact that the formel egel does not make a choice remains to be explained. 2. The descriptions do not fit the persons in the Richard-Anne theory. He offers as his explanation of the poem that it was written for use in the celebrations of the cult of St. Valentine, and that the poem is a conventional love vision, in which the central situation is a *demande d'amours*.

In defense of the Richard-Anne theory against the attacks of Miss Rickert and Mr. Manly, Miss Reid⁶ has urged that lines 697-699 are a veiled petition for favor, and that the story of the *Somnium Scipionis* is included in the poem to exhort the young King Richard to perform his public duties faithfully. The explanation that the last few lines of the poem are a veiled petition for favor might fit Miss Rickert's theory as well as the Richard-Anne theory, for the petition would then be addressed to John of Gaunt; but in that case the story of the *Somnium Scipionis* could hardly be considered an exhortation to John of Gaunt to perform his public duties faithfully. Such an exhortation, if it is one, is peculiarly fitting if addressed to a young man; but one could hardly conceive of the poet addressing it to a man somewhat older than himself. The theory that it is an exhortation has at least this much in its favor: it brings the *Somnium Scipionis* into closer unity with the rest of the poem; but to consider it an exhortation necessitates, I believe, that the person represented by the first suitor be a man considerably younger than Chaucer.

Let us consider all the arguments that have been brought forward in opposition to the Richard-Anne theory and see what parts of that theory must be discarded as definitely disproved.

⁶ *University Wisconsin Studies in Lang. and Lit.*, xviii (1923), 60-70.

Mr. Manly has definitely proved by astronomy that the poem could not have been begun in 1381, for lines 117-118 say that the poem was begun when Venus was north-northwest, and Venus was not in that position in 1381. Disregarding the possibility that the poem might have been begun at an earlier date but completed at a time when Chaucer wished to honor Richard and Anne with a poem, he fixes upon 1382, after the marriage of Richard and Anne, as the earliest date when the poem could have been started after Richard had shown any official interest in Anne. He asks, then, how can the poem be a compliment to a wedded couple when the *formel egel* refuses to make a choice and asks time to consider. Setting aside for a moment the possibility of the earlier origin, I should like to suggest that Mr. Manly has answered his own question about the poem being complimentary to a married couple even though the poem ends without the *formel egel* making a choice, by contending that the poem follows the form of the *demande d' amours*. Accepting this as true, does it not follow that the fact that the poem is a *demande d' amours* in form only, that it has lost the balance of that type while keeping to the form, so that the decision which should really be debatable is a foregone conclusion, implies that there is a real person who is to be complimented by the unbalancing of the presumably debatable question? If the two are already married, the apparent indecision at the end of the poem is explained as a convention of the *demande d' amours* type of poem, and is therefore not uncomplimentary to the wedded pair. Within the limits of the type of poem he was writing—a type chosen for its appropriateness for St. Valentine's Day—Chaucer brings the story of the wooing as nearly as possible to the point of acceptance. To tell of the acceptance in the poem would be contrary to the rules of the type; but Chaucer does everything but tell of it: he makes it inevitable, a foregone conclusion in the minds of the hearers.

It seems to me that in classifying it as a *demande d' amours* Mr. Manly has added a strong and needed argument in favor of the poem being allegorical, for it explains the inconclusive ending and allows one to assume that the poem was written either after the engagement or after the wedding. This assumption is necessary to the Richard-Anne theory; for if it were written before the wooing reached a successful conclusion, the poem would certainly not be

complimentary, and it would stand a good chance of becoming an unpleasant reminder of an unsuccessful attempt. Indeed, since Anne had been known to break engagements to wed, it seems to me likely that the cautious Chaucer waited until after the marriage to present his poetic compliment.

Mr. Manly says that lines 548-551, urging the acceptance of the suitor who has used his knighthood longest, are ludicrous when applied to Richard; but Miss Reid has aptly answered that "if Richard was old enough to deal with the Peasants' Rebellion in 1381, he was old enough to be spoken of in the terms which Chaucer uses here".⁷ I believe Mr. Manly has here fallen into the error of applying a twentieth century concept to a fourteenth century person. I do not think Richard would have noticed anything ludicrous in the lines, and that, of course, is the point at issue.

Of the three points raised by Miss Rickert against the Richard-Anne theory the first is that it does not explain the divergence from the *demande d' amours* type. This argument was directed against the theory that the poem was written before the engagement of Richard and Anne, and as such is sound. As soon as we shift ground a little, however, and propose that the poem was presented after the engagement, or even after the marriage, the argument loses its force; for the divergence of the poem from the balance of the *demande d' amours* is explained by the fact that it is a compliment to the person represented by the first suitor, now the winner, and the inconclusive ending (in form only) is necessitated by the type.

Miss Rickert's second point is that the Richard-Anne theory does not explain the satire upon the lower classes, which would have been particularly pleasing to John of Gaunt. Since the king put down the Peasants' Rebellion in 1381, we have reason to suppose that he might be pleased by this satire, as much as John of Gaunt. I believe, however, that if the poem is taken to be part of a celebration of the cult of St. Valentine, the satire may be explained in another way. The court circle, taking part in a celebration which implied an intimate understanding of the cult of courtly love, might well gain some amusement appropriate for the day by the poet's poking fun at the inability of the lower classes to appreciate

⁷ *Modern Philology*, xviii (1920), 29.

the fine points of the cult. Such amusement does not necessarily imply antagonism toward the lower classes, but merely an amused feeling of superiority.

Backing up her third point with historical evidence, Miss Rickert shows that Friedrich of Meissen and Charles VI were not suitors for the hand of Anne at the same time with Richard. She asserts that this proves that the theory is not supported by historical evidence. Again the theory must give a little ground in order to maintain itself. Granted that Friedrich and Charles were out of the running before Richard became interested in Anne. Still, this might be a case of chronological telescoping to gain dramatic effect. If this were the first, it would certainly not be the last time that English poets have laid rude hands on history and twisted it to serve their dramatic purposes. But it is not necessary that the two disappointed suitors be represented by real historical characters at all. Mr. Manly has pointed out a number of examples of "threes" in the *demande d' amours*. The presence of three suitors in the story may be only a convention of the type. To a newly engaged, or (as I think much more likely) newly married, couple, the inclusion of disappointed suitors in the story of the wooing is flattering, complimentary whether they existed in fact or not. The man likes to think that he has won in a contest, that he was the best, rather than the only, man in the field; and the woman likes to feel that there were others who considered her desirable as a wife. Even if it were not true, it would be subtly complimentary to the man to make him feel that he had won a woman who was equally desirable in the eyes of other men. Hence the Richard-Anne theory does not need to be discarded even if both the disappointed suitors are surrendered to the attack of the opposition.

Miss Reid has pointed out that the last lines of the poem may be construed as a bid for favor. Since Chaucer became controller of the petty customs in the port of London on April 20, 1382, and had been and still was at that time controller of the customs and subsidy of wool, woolfells, and hides in London,⁸ it would seem likely that he would wish to compliment the king with his poem; for he was holding an office from the king, and in 1381 he received two royal gifts, one of £22, the other of 10 marks. If, as I am

⁸ Manly: *Some New Light on Chaucer* (New York, 1926), p. 34.

attempting to show, the most likely date for the presentation of the *Parlement of Foules* was St. Valentine's Day of 1382, it is not unthinkable that the appointment of April 20, 1382, less than ten weeks afterwards, may have been to some extent the result of the poetic compliment. It may be true that John of Gaunt would be pleased to have the failure of his marriage plans for his daughter glossed over in this complimentary fashion by a poem in which Philippa refuses the suitors (though I doubt but that a reopening of the subject even for this purpose would only have made Gaunt a greater laughingstock for his enemies, for the various sources from which we glean information about Gaunt's plans imply that the plans were rather generally known), but the fact remains that Chaucer had already received favors from the king, and might well be anxious to retain and strengthen his position by complimenting the royal couple.

Summarizing all the new evidence that has been brought in, and modifying the Richard-Anne theory at every point where the evidence indicates that it needs modification, I suggest the following theory to explain the *Parlement of Foules*:

1. The poem is a conventional love-debate poem of the *demande d' amours* type, written for the celebration of the cult of St. Valentine.
2. It departs from the balance of the *demande d' amours*, throwing the decision to one of the suitors, thus implying that a real person is to be complimented.
3. If presented before the engagement, it would be a weak compliment; if presented after the engagement but before the marriage, it might turn into an unpleasant reminder of humiliation in case Anne should decide to break another engagement to wed; but if presented after the marriage, it would be highly complimentary and perfectly safe. Hence, it was probably composed to be read⁹ at court on St. Valentine's Day, 1382, one month after the marriage of Richard and Anne; and the formel egel and the first suitor represent Anne and Richard.
4. The inconclusive ending is explained by the necessity to stick to the *demande d' amours* form for the Valentine's Day poem.
5. It

⁹ Whether the whole poem was composed at this time, or whether it was begun at an earlier date and completed for the purpose stated here, is a question which does not affect the theory here presented; and it is therefore omitted from this present discussion.

is not necessary that the disappointed suitors in the poem be real people, for their presence in the poem may be explained by its type, and their inclusion is complimentary to the wedded pair, who could fill in the names to suit themselves. But the fact that Friedrich of Meissen and Charles VI were out of the race before Richard entered it does not preclude the possibility of their being represented by the other eagles, a chronological telescoping for dramatic effect being sufficient explanation of the historical difficulty.

6. The satire is not necessarily an indication that the person complimented was antagonistic to the lower classes, but even in that case the poem may still be supposed to apply to Richard.

7. The probability that Chaucer would choose to compliment Richard at this time rather than Gaunt is indicated by the fact that in 1381 Chaucer received gifts from the king totaling more than twice the amount of his annuity from John of Gaunt, the fact that he was the holder of an important office from the king, and the fact that on April 20, 1382, he received another office from the king.

8. The appointment of April 20, 1382, may easily have been the result of the reading of the poem at court less than ten weeks before that date.

THEODORE WAYLAND DOUGLAS.

Indiana University.

EINE UNBEKANNT KLOPSTOCK-ORIGINALAUSGABE

Den Klopstock-Forschern scheinen nur zwei Ausgaben letzter Hand bekannt zu sein, die sogenannte Grossquart- oder Fürsten-Ausgabe in 7 Bänden, Leipzig 1798-1809, und die Grossoktav-Ausgabe in 12 Bänden, Leipzig 1798-1817.¹ Dazu besitze ich die Bände 3-6, den *Messias* enthaltend, einer kleineren Quart-Ausgabe, deren Vorhandensein niemand beachtet zu haben scheint. Dies kommt vielleicht daher, dass weder Goedeke noch irgend ein anderer Bibliograph die nähere Beschreibung der zwei bisher bekannten Ausgaben gibt, so dass die neue Ausgabe sehr leicht entweder als Quart- oder als Grossoktav-Ausgabe betrachtet werden könnte. Ich

¹ So bei Goedeke, *Grundriss*, 3. Aufl., Bd. iv, 1, S. 177, 53, 54. Nebenbei sei bemerkt, dass die 7 Bände der grossen Ausgabe inhaltlich, Band für Band, mit den Bänden 1-7 der Oktav-Ausgabe übereinstimmen.

bemerke daher, dass die bisher bekannte Ausgabe in grösstem Format eigentlich nicht in Quarto, sondern Folio signiert ist: der dritte Band enthält z. B. 205 Seiten = 52 Bogen; der vierte Band, 181 Seiten = 46 Bogen; der fünfte Band, 281 Seiten = 71 Bogen; der sechste Band, 222 Seiten = 57 Bogen. Die Grösse des beschnittenen Exemplares beträgt 300×225 mm., der Satzspiegel, einschliesslich des Kopftitels, misst 195×147 mm.; die Seite enthält 24 Textzeilen, dazu kommt der Kopftitel mit Angabe des betr. Gesanges und der Verse. Jeder Band enthält ein Titelkupfer: H. F. Füger delt. F. John sc̄t. 1798.

Die äusserliche Einrichtung der neuen Quart-Ausgabe ist der der bekannten Folio-Ausgabe sehr ähnlich: die beiden Drucke gehen bis auf den Schluss des sechsten Bandes seitengleich miteinander, nur ist das Format hier Quart, anstatt Folio. Das beschnittene Exemplar misst 245×165 mm., der Satzspiegel 163×102 mm.; auch hier finden sich 24 Textzeilen auf der Seite, dazu kommt der Kopftitel mit Angabe des betr. Gesanges und der Verse. Das auch hier gebrauchte Velinpapier ist nicht so stark wie bei der Folio-Ausgabe, während Titelkupfer in den zwei mir vorliegenden Exemplaren nicht vorhanden sind. Kollation folgt:

Dritter Band. Haupttitel: Klopstocks Werke Dritter Band Der Messias Erster Band Leipzig Bey Georg Joachim Göschen. 1800. Spezialtitel: Der Messias Erster Band Leipzig Bey Georg Joachim Göschen. 1800. Untertitel: Der Messias. Erster Band; 205 Seiten = Bogen 1-26, letzterer zu 3 Bll. Bogennorm: KLOPST. W. III. B. MESS. I. B.; S. 206: Grimma, gedruckt bey Georg Joachim Göschen. Am Schluss der folgenden Bände dieselbe Angabe. Auch sonst haben die Bände 4-6 genau dieselbe Einrichtung: Vierter Band, 3 Titelbll., 181 Seiten = 23 Bogen, letzterer zu 3 Bll.; Fünfter Band, 3 Titelbll., 281 Seiten = 36 Bogen, letzterer ein Einzelblatt; Sechster Band, 3 Titelbll., 224 Seiten = 28 Bogen, dazu ein unbezeichnetes Einzelblatt mit Verbesserungen.

Bis S. 214 des 6. Bandes stimmen die Folio- und die Quart-Ausgabe zeilen- und seitengleich überein: der folgende Prosatext ("Zum Nachschlagen") nimmt in dieser mehr Raum ein als in jener (10 Seiten, anstatt 8), folglich geht die Pagination bis 224, anstatt 222 der Folio-Ausgabe.

Das beschnittene Exemplar der Oktav-Ausgabe hat die Blattgrösse 200×122 mm.; Satzspiegel 150×84 mm., einschliesslich

des Kopftitels; 25 Textzeilen auf der Seite, dazu den Kopftitel; die fünf mir vorliegenden Exemplare sind sämtlich auf Druckpapier.²

Dritter Band: Titelkupfer, Heinrich Schmidt gest: Leipz. 1800; Haupttitel, Spezialtitel, Untertitel, wie die vorhergehende Ausgabe, auch ist das Datum 1800; 320 Seiten = Bogen 1-19 zu je 16 Seiten, Bogen 20, 21 zu je 8 Seiten; Bogennorm KLOPST. w. III. b. MESS. 1. b. Die Bände 4-6, gleichfalls mit dem Datum 1800, haben dieselbe Einrichtung: Vierter Band, Titelkupfer, 3 Titelbl., 272 Seiten = Bogen 1-16 zu je 16 Seiten, Bogen 17, 18 zu je 8 Seiten; Fünfter Band, Titelkupfer, 3 Titelbl., 352 Seiten = Bogen 1-21 zu je 16 Seiten, Bogen 22, 23 zu je 8 Seiten; Sechster Band, Titelkupfer, 3 Titelbl., 262 Seiten, 1 Bl.: Grimma, gedruckt bey Georg Joachim Göschen, = 16 Bogen zu je 16 Seiten, Bogen 17 zu 8 Seiten. Es existieren mehrere Doppeldrucke (vgl. Goedeke, IV, 1, 177, 54); ferner lassen sich, was meines Wissens noch nicht bemerkt worden ist, an mehreren Stellen Kartons erkennen, auf die wir weiter unten zurückkommen werden.

Schliesslich sei noch bemerkt, dass bei sämtlichen Ausgaben nur das erste Titelblatt entfernt zu werden brauchte, um aus dem 3.-6. Bande der Werke den 1.-4. Band des *Messias* zu machen: in einem der beiden mir vorliegenden Exemplare der Quart-Ausgabe ist dies geschehen.

Wichtig ist die Feststellung der Reihenfolge der drei Ausgaben. Die Folio-Ausgabe (F), die allein das Datum 1799 trägt, wird auch sonst als älteste Ausgabe bezeugt. Die Quart-Ausgabe (Q) sowie die Oktav-Ausgabe (O) haben beide das Datum 1800. Da nun Q stets seiten- und zeilengleich mit F übereinstimmt, so muss jene Ausgabe von dieser abgedruckt worden sein: O könnte dann entweder von F oder von Q abstammen. Die unten gegebenen Lesarten sprechen für den ersten Fall, nämlich dass Q and O

² Viscount Goschen, *The Life and Times of Georg Joachim Goschen*, London, 1903, II, 144, gibt an: "As in the case of Wieland, so in this, there were four editions: the great Quarto edition, costing £7 1s; Large Octavo, Velin Papier, £1 9s. 6d.; Schreib Papier, £1 1s. 9d.; Druck Papier, 16s." Diese Preis-Angaben beziehen sich auf die Bände 1-6. Bei Wieland handelte es sich um vier verschiedene Formate und Sätze: möglicherweise könnte "Large Octavo, Velin Papier" sich auf unsere Quart-Ausgabe beziehen, aber dann wäre wohl der Preis bedeutend höher gewesen.

unabhängig von einander auf F zurückgehen. Dann könnte auch O vor, oder gleichzeitig mit Q gedruckt worden sein. Durch die Vergleichung der zu QO benutzten Typen wird nun die Priorität von O sicher gestellt.

Diese Typen sind nämlich von genau derselben Grösse, im allgemeinen auch ganz ähnlich, aber trotzdem nicht identisch. Dies lässt sich am leichtesten an den Lettern K, k beobachten: in O bestehen diese durchweg aus drei geraden Strichen (Type 1), in Q ist dagegen der untere schräge Strich stets gerundet (Type 2). Diesen Unterschied in den Typen der Göschen'schen Offizin habe ich in meiner Abhandlung über "Die Doppeldrucke in ihrer Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte von Wielands Werken"³ besprochen. Dort wurde gezeigt (S. 22, 40 f.) das die Type 1 die ältere ist, indem nur diese in den Originaldrucken der in den Jahren 1794-1800 erschienenen Bände 1-32 der Wieland-Ausgabe vorkommt: Type 2 lässt sich zuerst vereinzelt in den Bänden 33, 34 (1800), dann häufiger in Band 35 (1801) nachweisen; anfangend mit Bogen L dieses Bandes kommt fast ausschliesslich nur noch Type 2 vor. Dieser Sachbestand erklärt sich ganz ungezwungen durch die Annahme, dass Göschen gegen Ende des Jahres 1800 genötigt war, neues Material anzuschaffen, nämlich die Type 2, welche zuerst zur Ergänzung und dann zum Ersatz des alten, schadhaft gewordenen diente.

Es ist also völlig sicher, dass die mit der neuen Type 2 gedruckte Klopstock-Ausgabe Q jünger ist als O. Dies wird auch durch die oben erwähnten Kartonblätter von O bestätigt: in einem meiner Exemplare lassen sich nämlich die Seiten 165 f., 237 f., 291 f. des 5. Bandes, sowie 31 f. und 65 f. des 6. Bandes als Kartons erkennen: nur auf einem einzigen dieser neugedruckten Blätter (Bd. 5, S. 291 f.) überwiegt noch die Type 1, auf sämtlichen andern kommt entweder ausschliesslich oder vorwiegend die Type 2 vor. Mutmasslich ist Q also erst im Jahre 1801 erschienen, wie der Wieland-Band 35. Diese Annahme wird noch durch eine weitere Bemerkung gestützt. Wie schon oben angegeben, sind die Ausgaben OQ mit Lettern von derselben Grösse gedruckt. Wenn nun Göschen schon 1800, beim Satz der Ausgabe O, den Plan gefasst hätte, die Ausgabe

³ *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jahrgg. 1913, Phil.-hist. Cl. Nr. 7.

Q zu veranstalten, so hätte er diese von dem, zwar gelegentlich umgebrochenen, Satze von O abziehen können. Dadurch hätte er ganz bedeutende Ersparnisse an Satzkosten gemacht: da er dies nicht tat, ist anzunehmen dass O schon abgelegt war, als Q geplant wurde.

Die Lesarten der drei Ausgaben bestätigen die Reihenfolge FOQ. Da der Druck mit grosser Sorg'alt überwacht wurde⁴ sind die Abweichungen verhältnismässig selten: man kann stellenweise viele Seiten vergleichen, ohne nur auf ein eingefügtes Komma zu stossen. Am Schlusse der Ausgaben FQ findet sich je ein Blatt mit Verbesserungen: die dort angeführten Stellen sind hier durch den Zusatz *Verb.* gekennzeichnet. Die Sigle Ob bezeichnet einen Doppeldruck der Oktav-Ausgabe, *Kart.* ein Kartonblatt.

Dritter Band: Messias II, 408 Getös FO Getös' Q (*Verb.*) II, 112 und Bruder F (*Verb.*) und der Bruder OQ v. 326 eh' F eh OQ v. 634 Auge, FQ Auge O v. 858 zerflöß' F zerflöss' OQ III, 42 Beider FQ Beyder O v. 124 zerflöß' F zerflöss' OQ v. 139 schlöß' F schlöss' OQ v. 468 Wächter, FO Wächter. Q v. 589 Kennst F (*Verb.*) Kennest OQ v. 640 unermüdendem FQ unermüdedem O unermüdetem Ob IV, 132 des Ewigen FO des ewigen Q v. 162 Geist, FO Geist Q v. 276 Reih', FQ Reih' O v. 733 den weinende F (*Verb.*) der weinenden OQ

Vierter Band: Messias VI, 184 deckt' FQOb deckt O v. 267 Ein FO ein Q v. 309 ohn Eine FO ohn' Eine Q v. 371 Aller FO aller Q v. 600 Hasser! FO Hasser? Q VIII, 559 Himmel; FQ Himmel! O IX, 109 Einmahl F Einmal OQ v. 545 Mitleid' FQ Mitleid O X, 285 vor Allen FQ vor allen O v. 519 gestanden! FQ gestanden: O

Fünfter Band: Messias XI, 756 Sohns, des FQ (*Verb.*) Sohns, und des O XII, 17 Öd' und FQ Öd und O v. 73 zu: FQ zu! O v. 84 Leichnam. FQ Leichnam, O v. 284 Himmel: FQ Himmel! O XIII, 469 Er FQ er O v. 472 nicht; FQ

⁴ Hauptsächlich von J. G. Seume. Vgl. Oskar Planer und Camillo Reißmann, *Johann Gottfried Seume*, S. 199-208: wo nachträglich ein Druckfehler entdeckt wurde, musste das betreffende Blatt neugedruckt werden: vgl. das in Anm. 2 zitierte Werk von Goschen, Bd. II, S. 142: "Ultimately the publisher's vanity prevailed over economy, and induced him to reprint on a large scale."

nicht: O v. 635 gesegnet die FQ (und O *Kart.*) gesegnet sey die O v. 712 Triumphe FQ Triumpfe O v. 771 auf, FQ auf O v. 777 früheren FO frühen Q (*Verb.*) XIV, 88 Einmal, FQ Einmal O v. 940 schweigst FQ (und O *Kart.*) schweigest OOb XV, 109 kein' FQ (*Verb.* Q) kein O v. 489 grösster, und FQ grösster ihm, und Q (und O *Kart.*)

Sechster Band: Messias XVI, 589 Stürmendes Fluges FQ (und O *Kart.*) Stürmenden Fluges O XVII, 515 Ernst, und FO Ernst, Q (*Verb.*) v. 551 Maria Grabe FQ (und O *Kart.*) Maria O XIX, 122 leben; FQ leben, O v. 478 Ein FQ ein O v. 666 Dämmrung FQ Dämmrung, O v. 679 sinken!. FQ sinken! O v. 876 immer, FQ immer O Die folgenden Stellen nicht nach Gesang und Vers, sondern Seite und Zeile von O: 195, 5 halleten FQ hallten O 196, 14 sie Wehklag' ausrief F die Wehklag' ausrief OQ 229, 20 ach, FQ ach O 244, 9 setzte FQ setzte O 249, 18 Kreuze FQ Kreuz O 250, 13 Jacob FQ Jakob O 257, 8 Ausgiefung F Ausgiefsung OQ 259, 12 Nephtoa FQ Nephthoa O.

Keine einzige der hier angeführten Lesarten widerspricht der angenommenen Reihenfolge FOQ: jeder der beiden jüngeren Drucke geht unabhängig von dem andern auf F zurück, jeder macht neue Fehler, jeder korrigiert gelegentlich einen Fehler seiner Vorlage. An einer, oben nicht mit verzeichneten Stelle (XV, 1292) haben alle drei Ausgaben den Druckfehler *litt'ich*, der allein in den Verbesserungen von Q angemerkt wird—ein weiterer Beweis, dass dies die jüngste Ausgabe ist. Nur eine einzige Stelle (6. Bd. S. 196, 14) deutet auf nähere Verwandtschaft zwischen OQ, indem die den beiden gemeinsame Lesart *die Wehklag'* wohl nur als Druckfehler zu erklären ist. Die Peinlichkeit der vom Verleger angestrebten Korrektheit ersieht man aus den Kartonblättern von O, die jedesmal einer einzigen Stelle wegen gedruckt wurden: an zwei von den betreffenden Stellen handelt es sich nicht einmal um tatsächliche Druckfehler—XVI, 940 schweigest O schweigest *Karton*; XVI, 589 Stürmenden Fluges O Stürmendes Fluges *Karton*.

W. KURRELMAYER.

**MRS. BRACEGIRDLE'S ACTING IN CROWNE'S
*JUSTICE BUSY***

To admirers of the racy notes on actors and actresses of the Restoration made by John Downes in his *Roscius Anglicanus* (London, 1708), it will not be particularly welcome to discover that one of his pleasantest, if most cryptic, passages may be soberly explained from contemporary material. Readers have enjoyed, somewhat uncritically I fear, the following vigorous description of Mrs. Bracegirdle's performance in John Crowne's unprinted play *Justice Busy; or the Gentleman Quack*, acted at Lincoln's Inn Field's Theatres *circa 1699*:¹

Justice Busy, a Comedy wrote by Mr. *Crown*; 'twas well *Acted*, yet prov'd not a living play: However Mrs. *Bracegirdle*, by a Potent and Magnetick Charm in performing a Song in 't, caus'd the *Stones of the Streets to fly in the Men's Faces*.

The play is lost forever, beyond a doubt, but that the songs from it found their way into the music books was noted by J. O. Halliwell, as follows:

Justice Busy: or, the Gentleman Quack; A Comedy by J. Crowne, acted at Lincoln's Inn Fields about 1699. Not printed, but the songs introduced into it were published separately with the music. Downes's remarks on Mrs. Bracegirdle follow.²

The mere reproduction of the words of one of these songs will serve to gloss Downes's description, which, by the way, he was careful to italicize, and to explode the pretty but after all extremely obscure hyperbole which students of the theatre have considered a quaint tribute to Mrs. Bracegirdle.³

A Song in the Comedy call'd *Justice Buisy*, or the *Gentleman Quack*; Set by Mr. John Eccles, Sung by Mrs. Bracegirdle; and exactly engrav'd by Tho. Cross.

¹ Cf. Downes: *Roscius Anglicanus, or an Historical Review of the Stage from 1660 to 1706*, ed. Joseph Knight, London, 1886, p. 45; Egerton's *Theatrical Remembrancer*, London, 1788, p. 94; *Biographia Dramatica*, London, 1812, Vol. I, Part I, p. 159; Genest: *Some Account of the English Stage*, Bath, 1832, II, 144.

² J. O. Halliwell: *A Dictionary of Old English Plays*, London, 1860, p. 136. See also G. P. Winship: *A Bibliography of the Restoration Dramatist John Crowne*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1922, p. 17.

³ Cf. e. g. Hazelton Spencer: *Shakespere Improved*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1927, p. 99.

I'll hurry, hurry, hurry, hurry thee,
 hurry, hurry, hurry, hurry thee hence, with such Violence:
 ||: The Lightning from my Chariot-wheels, and my Horses heels,
 and my Horses heels, shall make the Pavement shine. :||
 If any man stops my furious Race,
 ye Stones in the Street shall fly in his Face:
 The Stones in the Street shall fly, shall fly, shall fly in his Face:
 ||: As Nature does in mine, in mine,
 As Nature does in mine. :|| *

The "Potent and Magnetick Charm" of such a woman remains unchallenged, even though a legend be shattered.

Harvard University.

ROBERT GALE NOYES.

NOTES ON MILTON'S APPEARANCE

In his *Secret of John Milton* (Dorpat, 1925), Dr. Heinrich Mutschmann quotes George Vertue, the painter, as to Milton's complexion, pointing out that Vertue obtained his information from Milton's daughter. But he neglects to add that while Milton's daughter described her father's complexion as 'fair . . . a little red in his cheeks,' she also described his hair as 'light brown lank hair' (*Nichols's Literary Anecdotes*, II, 248).

At first glance, this description of Milton's hair, by one who certainly knew him, might seem irrefutable evidence against Dr.

* The words and music are found in a collection of songs in the British Museum [B. M. k. 7. i. 2 (49)], catalogued under John Eccles: "I'll hurry thee hence, in the comedy *Justice Buisy*," London, 1700, p. 63.

A second song from the play, "A Song in the Comedy call'd Justice Buisy, or the Gentleman Quack; Set by Mr. John Eccles, Sung by Mrs. Bracegirdle" may be printed here for completeness, although it is more accessible than the preceding:

No, no, ev'ry Morning my Beauties renew,
 Where-ever I go, I have Lovers enough;
 I Dress and I Dance, and I Laugh and I Sing,
 Am lovely and lively, and gay as the Spring:
 I Visit, I Game, and I cast away Care,
 Mind Lovers no more, than the Birds of the Air,
 Mind Lovers no more, than the Birds of the Air.

(D'Urfey's *Wit and Mirth*; or, *Pills to Purge Melancholy*, London, 1719, v, 323.)

Mutschmann's theory of albinism. But it is, I think, not quite so conclusive as it appears.

To begin with, Milton's daughter may have been, like Milton himself, weak in the ability to distinguish colors accurately or nicely. She may have been careless in terminology, like many of us. These possibilities are, however, as far as I know, mere guesses.

Nevertheless, it is important to remember that Milton's daughter was describing the appearance of her father as it contrasted with the painting that Vertue showed her, in which the complexion was 'brown,' the hair was 'black,' and the locks were 'curled.' The daughter was interested in contrasting her father's true coloring with this of the painting: to this end, she contrasted 'fair' to 'brown' in regard to complexion, and 'light brown' to 'black' in regard to hair. Now this 'light brown,' used in contrast to 'black,' can hardly have definite color value. It may mean almost any blond hue, varying from a pronounced brown to the lack-lustre yellow of the hair of some albinos. Evidently Milton's daughter meant to say that her father's hair was not 'black,' and was not 'white'; but just what shade or tint she may have meant by 'light brown' is a matter of pure speculation: the phrase may be variously interpreted. Milton's daughter was emphasizing lightness rather than brownness, it would seem; and perhaps she was handling her color name with a view to the 'brown' complexion of the portrait she was criticizing. 'Brown' is, after all, as vague a color name as we have.

The statement of Milton's daughter to Vertue, then, while it tends to cast doubt on the theory of Dr. Mutschmann, is really no valid refutation of the theory supported from many sides, because of its very marked vagueness.

Dr. Mutschmann quotes Keats in his argument on Milton's albinism. Keats, seeing a lock of Milton's hair at Leigh Hunt's, wrote: 'a lock of thy bright hair.' An adjective is used here quite obviously inapplicable to brown or white or black hair. Again, Keats speaks of 'fair-haired Milton's eloquent distress' (*Keen, fitful gusts*).

But it seems to have escaped the notice of Dr. Mutschmann that Keats saw the lock of Milton's hair on 21 January 1818, and saw it then for the first time (for Hunt had just got it); whereas the sonnet containing the reference to 'fair-haired Milton'

A NOTE ON THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF KEATS 393

appeared in the volume of 1817. Whence did Keats have his notion, then, that Milton was 'fair-haired'? So far, I have been unable to find an answer to this question.

Nevertheless, the very fact that Keats, to whom colors and color names were quite real and specific, used the word 'fair' in describing Milton's hair, is of considerable importance in showing that the notion of Milton as dark-haired was not always held by all admirers of Milton. (However, 'fair,' in Keats, may refer to whiteness, as in *St. Agnes*, 218.)

S. A. NOCK.

The Rice Institute.

A NOTE ON THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF KEATS

Amy Lowell pointed out the fact that Keats's lines beginning "Hither, hither, love" were first printed by John Howard Payne in *The Ladies' Companion* for August, 1837.¹ She failed to mention, however, that Payne also printed, at the same time, three other poems by Keats: "Fame, like a wayward girl, will still be coy"; "As Hermes once took to his feathers light"; and "'Tis the witching time of night" (later entitled "A Prophecy").² "As Hermes once took to his feathers light" was first printed by Leigh Hunt in the *Indicator* for June, 1820.³ The other two poems are usually considered to have appeared first in Lord Houghton's *Life, Letters and Literary Remains of John Keats*, 1848.⁴

When Payne visited Louisville, Kentucky to secure patrons for a proposed *Belles-Lettres Journal of the Two Hemispheres*, George Keats presented him with the manuscript of "Hither, hither, love," and copied out the other poems for him.⁵

CLARENCE GOHDES.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

¹ *John Keats*, Vol. I, p. 113.

² *The Ladies' Companion*, N. Y., Vol. VII, pp. 186-187.

³ Amy Lowell, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 429.

⁴ See, for example, E. De Sélincourt, *Poems of John Keats*, revised ed., pp. 536 and 550.

⁵ *The Ladies' Companion*, vol. VII, pp. 186-7.

REVIEWS

Shelley, His Life and Work. By WALTER EDWIN PECK. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1927. 2 vols. xiii, 532, vii, 490 pp.

It is now just over forty years since the late Professor Dowden published his great biography of Shelley. Full and authoritative as it was—or possibly because it was authoritative—it did not altogether satisfy every class of readers. One could not but admire its refined if somewhat ornate style, its cautious if not absolutely impartial judgment. But its mild and dignified apologetic tone was found either too warm or too cold by some Victorian critics, and many Georgians of course have grown quite impatient with it. Some minor facts, besides, and a considerable amount of letters, have been unearthed since 1886; and so many people remain curious about Shelley's life—indeed one sometimes wonders whether they do not outnumber the mere lovers of Shelley's poetry—that everywhere the time was felt to be coming for a dispassionate review of this ever-pending case of "Ariel."

Professor Peck has long been known as the patient and robust gleaner who had undertaken to go over the whole field and gather whatever ears had been overlooked by his predecessors. He has been in a fair position to do the work. His time in Oxford was long enough to familiarise him—a more difficult thing than would seem to the uninitiated—with Shelley's often elusive manuscript idiosyncrasies. And if he has not been fortunate enough to make in England any great discoveries similar to those which enabled Mr. Ingpen to pack his book on *Shelley in England* (1917) with fresh material, he has been allowed by the generosity of American collectors to use at will the many documents which have found their way over the Atlantic in more or less recent years. His harvest is now garnered, in two goodly volumes, whose appearance, both ponderous and luxurious, is full of promise for the student.

The work is undoubtedly the fruit of great labour. It was no easy task to weave into a connected narrative all the minutiae of information which figure prominently among the new things here available, indeed the difficulty was such that one wonders at the writer's courage. Professor Peck would have been undoubtedly more successful if he had not aimed so high, if he had been content with the rôle of a recorder, and presented us with a collection of dry data: they might have been mere references, when the sources are easily accessible, printing in full being reserved (as in the bulky appendices to vol. ii) for those things—Miss Hitchens' letters, the poet's orders to his bankers, some letters of

Godwin, a list of Shelley's cheques,¹ etc.,—which their novelty, though not always their importance, would have made the most interesting items in a repertory of this kind. Though Professor Peck has tried not to exaggerate the value of those additions to our knowledge, it can hardly be denied that the use he makes of them in the body of his work detracts from the artistic economy of the whole production.

For biography is an art, and a very delicate one. It cannot simply and mechanically register the chronological series of events in their perplexing disorder. It must occasionally make logical groups of them, and consequently read the past and the future into the present. And even such groups have to fit into each other. An impression of continuity and growth has to be conveyed. Fresh developments have to be plausibly introduced. In fact a work of this kind must be a clever compromise between the artificial and the natural, a thing in which psychology combines with history proper to make it beautiful.

This nice control of the backward and forward movements of a pleasant and intelligible story, these careful preparations, consolidations and gradations, which turn a "life" into a "biography," are not, it must be admitted, the salient merits of the present work. It is not self-supporting enough, it takes too much for granted, to provide the complete, coherent, harmonious account that would supersede Dowden's. Precisely, no doubt, because he is so full of his subject, Professor Peck forgets to tell the reader something about Eliza Westbrook, and Jane Clairmont, and Marianne Hunt, and Henry Reveley, and "Paolo," as he introduces their names into his chronicle. Of course reference to standard books like Dowden's or Ingpen's is easy, but it is a pity that a new narrative on the scale adopted by Professor Peck should so often make it necessary. Indeed there is at least one case in which I confess I am nonplussed by the author's allusive ways: in his attempted interpretation of the autobiographical passages of *Epipsychedion* (II, 192) he says: "Shelley's affection for Mrs. Boinville, Cornelia Turner, and *Mrs. Taylor* is next referred to": the index has nothing to tell us about this new "unknown lady"—or "mystery woman," as Professor Peck prefers to call such persons; who was *Mrs. Taylor*?

Such hitches are puzzling and disquieting for the attentive reader. The story of course is fairly complete as it stands, and there is a laudable attempt to present it more objectively than has hitherto been done; the lights and shades are distributed—

¹ Also that rather deplorable ballad on "Parson Richards" (in which by the way, after a look at the Harvard Ms., I am tempted to read "the merry beast ate Moving his tail & his head" instead of "the mere beast ate," as in Professor Peck's transcript).

notably in the Harriet Westbrook episode—with a firm if not sensitive hand; and there is also a wealth of parallels and cross references in the literary interchapters, where a good deal of grain (if also a good deal of chaff) may be gathered by the student. But whether in the literary or biographical portions, the stresses are not always laid where they should be. The titles of the last chapters, e.g., are flippantly incongruous ("Emilia's Marriage" and "Trelawny Arrives"!). And important data for the intelligence of Shelley's life and work are quite frequently passed over in silence. The ominous gap in the diaries for 1815 is not mentioned, nor is the first translation of *Faust*—so significant for the disputed question of Shelley's knowledge of German; nor are the *Fantasmagoriana*, read in Switzerland, with such powerful effect on the whole of Shelley's circle; and it is left for non-American biographies to recall his interest in Brockden Brown's novels.

The strangest thing in this respect is that Professor Peck sometimes omits the results of his own painstaking investigations. Thus I find here no echo of the information he gave us in 1925 (in the *PMLA*) on the novel of "Vulvius"—it should have been "Vulpinus"—*Rinaldo Rinaldini*, and the use made of it by Shelley in *St. Irvyne*, *Laon and Cythna* and (less probably) *Prince Athanase*. Yet that information was—to me at least—far more convincing than the ascription to Shelley of an anonymous article in *The Indicator* for 1820 on which Professor Peck still insists here (I, ch. i.).

One cannot escape the conclusion that the composition of this work is strangely defective. The basis seems to have been laid for a great structure, rich material was prepared, and then apparently the architect was pressed for time and gave up some parts of his original design, and indeed botched up a temporary fabric that surely does not satisfy his own practised sense. The style of a book on Shelley need not, assuredly, adopt the dazzling brilliancy of Thompson's great *Essay*; but a minimum of care and delicacy should, one would think, in respect to the poet, be preserved. I am afraid that quite a number of Professor Peck's sentences, amusing perhaps and stimulating as they might be in a familiar conversation, will give offence to the readers of his book. P. 51: "The figure of the Wandering Jew . . . set his finger tips itching to be at an apologia for the unhappy and long-chastened Hebrew"—p. 110: "the two young men who were not usual in anything, but unusual in everything"—p. 267: "the lines of attack which Shelley was to follow may be hypothesized from the quotations. . . .", and many other such passages seem as poor in taste as sometimes in grammar. The candid but indulgent critic is in fact obliged to record his impression that some untoward

circumstance has hurried the last stages of the production of these volumes.

There is at first an extraordinary number of faults all of which can hardly be laid at the door of the printer: in vol. I, p. 33, a note 11 illustrates no particular passage in the text—p. 94, “that days which are past” should be “the days”—p. 95, we hear of *Epips*. “II” as if the poem had two parts—not only do we have “millenium” p. 102 and “strengthing” p. 111 and “Stacy,” p. 124 n., but repeatedly “Hurstperpoint” for “Hurstpierpoint”—p. 161, in a quotation which glories in various corrections, we read “mitigate with reason” for “militate with reason”—p. 203, “Coplestone” for “Copleston”—p. 250 n. Shelley is said to have been in London “watching the Prince Regent” on the very day, Jan. 20, 1812 “on which he sent Miss Hitchener” a poem (from Keswick!)—p. 301 “126” pages of notes in Queen Mab should be read for “216”—p. 340, Plutarch is said to have written about “Sarcophagi”—p. 426, we have *αφιλαρτία* for *αφιλαντία*.—The second volume is hardly better: p. 7, “tranquillity of freedom,” again in a quotation, should be “of freedom”—p. 12 n., “Veduti” should be “Vedute”—p. 119, “statutes” should be “statues”—p. 121 and 163, (Italian) read “dei” for “die”—p. 169, the extract from *The Sensitive Plant* is badly punctuated—p. 197 and elsewhere, “Mavrocordatos” should be “Mavrocordato”—p. 212, the passage in Keats’s letter, “I have very much too much heart to prophecy” should be “I have at heart”—p. 252, the new and better text for *The serpent is shut out of Paradise* proposes “mind’s prison” instead of the usual and obviously correct “poison.” Even the Appendices, where the “new documents” should have been particularly unimpeachable on this score, offer many dubious and many manifestly wrong texts; p. 385, “5, Abbey Church Yard” is an address that surely goes with the next item—p. 407, read “Lorenzo” for “Lorenza.”

Many other, and often more important corrections are needed: vol. I, p. 58 still prints in the body of the letter of April 1, 1810, the passage “But why Harriet more than any one else—a faint essay, I see, in return for my enquiry for Caroline” which I think an examination of the Oxford MS. shows to have been intended as a mere Postscript, and is thus less disturbing to the context—p. 76, the passages on Shelley’s knowledge of the Greek writers in Hogg, if carefully read, hardly support the idea that the poet at Oxford was so familiar with Plutarch, Plato and Euripides—p. 87, the corrections in Hogg’s letters which I published in 1910 were not, as I was careful to observe, from the “holographs” but from notes apparently taken from the originals and inserted in a copy of Lady Shelley’s privately printed book, *Shelley and Mary*, then preserved at Boscombe; in fact the whole problem of the

exact text of Shelley's letters to Hogg is still unsolved—p. 97 and 102, to imagine that Spinoza was read by Shelley at an early date seems the result of the extraordinary mistake which in the correspondence (as published even in the costly Julian Edition) reads, s. d. Jan. 12, 1811: "I will answer in the words of Spinoza: an infinite number of atoms had been floating from all eternity in space, till at last one of them fortuitously diverged from its track" etc.; any dabbler at the history of philosophy knows that this is Epicurus', not Spinoza's notion, and of course in Shelley's handwriting the two names may have looked very much alike—p. 132 gives a useful list of articles of Shelleyan interest in Hunt's various papers; it corrects Barnette Miller's in some cases, but it leaves out some of the latter's findings, whilst falling into errors which had not been committed previously: *Marianne's Dream* and *The Sunset* were not published in the *Literary Pocket-Book* for 1823, but in 1819 and partly in 1823 respectively—p. 382, "Noe" should be "Nouaille" and p. 484, the whole geography of the return journey from Geneva is bungled: Morez (not "Moray"), Arbois, Poligny, Dole, Auxonne, Genlis, is the route followed by Shelley.—In the same way vol. II, p. 61, gives as "Pont Beau Vois" a place which Dowden already gave correctly as Pont de Beauvoisin—I, p. 511, the summary of the infants' petition is very misleading in its imperfect grammar "since Shelley left his wife she and the children had been supported partly by Harriet (one concludes this must mean "by herself") and partly by John Westbrook": the partial support of course came from Shelley (cf. the texts in Forman's ed. of Medwin's Life)—p. 527 the fragment (where read *τετράποντος* for *τετραπόντος*) is obviously an answer to the letter from Hogg which I published in 1910, and therefore later than April 25, 1817—in vol. II, p. 258 it was not Mary who asked Shelley if he had resolution, but Shelley who asked Mary if she believed he had resolution—p. 409 surely Trelawny did not write, speaking of Hunt's poetry, that it was "venisomly monotonous" but possibly "werisomly"—spelling was never one of his strong points—and the unintelligible "no power thought . . . then" is no doubt "no sooner . . . than"—p. 435, it was not Mary but Lady Shelley who gave manuscripts to Dr. Garnett, and the sale of his library took place in 1906 not in 1900.

I apologise for giving such a long excerpt from a very much longer list of errata. Every one knows that "la critique est aisée, et l'art est difficile"—especially in the Shelleyan field, where there is such a bewildering variety and intricacy in the sources of information. One merit, let us repeat in conclusion, the work undoubtedly has: its biographical material is presented with a sort of plain common sense that is likely to satisfy the average reader more than many sentimental sophistications have done. But I am afraid

on the whole it is far, both artistically and scientifically, from being what was desired, and indeed expected from the writer; and pending another edition, it will be one of those books—already too numerous—to which critics have to refer, though at the cost of frequent irritation, and at the risk of many an error.

A. KOSZUL.

Université de Strasbourg.

Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage. By HENRY ADELBERT WHITE. Yale Studies in English, LXXVI, Yale University Press, 1927. Pp. 259. \$2.50.

The Life and Works of Edward Moore. By JOHN HOMER CASKEY. Yale Studies in English, LXXV, 1927. Pp. 202. \$2.00.

Shakespeare Improved: The Restoration Versions in Quarto and on the Stage. By HAZELTON SPENCER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. xii + 406. \$5.00.

On October 10th, 1832, Drury Lane staged a grand pageant in honor of Sir Walter Scott. This pageant, which was to the romantic novelist what Garrick's Jubilee was to Shakespeare, testifies to the position which Scott once occupied, not only in the minds of readers, but in those of playhouse spectators.

Mr. White, apparently, does not mention this commemorative production and his study omits a few other facts of importance bearing on his subject; but on the whole his survey of *Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage* can be heartily praised. This work wanted doing, for, if we cannot hold up the dramatic *Rob Roy's* and *Montroses* as literary masterpieces, if the process of "Terryfication" lead often to folly and bathos, we have to remember that Scott's novels were one of the great determining influences both on the English and Continental stages. Indeed, for the English stage the influence is well-nigh incalculable. We dimly realise its force when we note that *The Monastery* and *Guy Mannering*, both made into separate English plays, were utilised by Scribe for his *La Dame Blanche*, and that *La Dame Blanche*, in versions as *The White Lady* or *The White Maid*, recrossed the Channel to take its place alongside the native dramatic renderings of those two novels.

Mr. White's survey, so far as it goes, is accurate and detailed, although he seems to lack knowledge of the background of melodrama and of operatic farce against which to set the Scott plays. A general statement of the type:

Another playhouse engaged some musicians to scrape now and then on their fiddles, so that a legitimate drama could be claimed as a genuine musical play,

reveals a vague misconception of the place of the "burletta" in the nineteenth century theatre and of the regulations governing the minor playhouses. All the minors had their scraping fiddlers, or at least their tinkling pianists, and the music, which may at times have been exaggerated to "heighten the emotional effect" (p. 134) was not there by choice but of necessity. It seems unfortunate, too, that Mr. White did not provide a bibliography of the dramatic versions of the novels. He has given us a very useful list of productions, starring those plays he has read and providing us with a few footnotes which indicate that such and such a play "was published in London in 1820." Such vague references, however, are hardly likely to be of use for future students and Mr. White's list would have been of treble value had he outlined the scope of the printed text. In thus referring to a bibliography, it may not be inopportune to note that several of the unprinted adaptations are still preserved in two great collections—one in the Henry E. Huntington Library of California and the other in London.

In *The Life and Works of Edward Moore*, Mr. J. H. Caskey returns to an earlier period, when sentimentalism was rife and the romantic melodrama of the Scott adaptations was as yet undreamt of. Mr. Caskey's study is detailed and accurate, and, like Mr. White's, fills an undoubtedly gap in the history of English literature. Moore's *The Gamester* had at one time a world-wide fame, and even today, when manners have changed and when the domestic drama has attained a subtlety impossible of achievement in the eighteenth century, that tragedy can still be read and performed with interest. Here a man of mediocre abilities, writing from his heart, succeeded in producing something which has been almost able to stand the test of time. Mr. Caskey in his study has done well not to over-exaggerate the virtues of his subject; as a consequence his essay possesses a certain balance and distinction. He grants that Moore had not the enthusiasm of genius, yet he succeeds in showing us a man who, capable and sincere, filled by no means an unimportant position in eighteenth century life. With tempered criticism Mr. Caskey sums up his qualities and presents him as he was—a man likely "to inspire sympathy and loyal friendship, especially from his superiors, but not to gather men about him," a man for whom, as for Richardson, social virtues counted more than artistic.

Yale University is doing excellent work in the publication of these studies in minor fields of English literature. In making known the results of detailed research such as is presented here it is indeed serving the interests of a wider scholarship.

Professor Hazelton Spencer is heartily to be congratulated. He

has succeeded, as so few succeed, in blending the popular with the scholarly; it might be better to say that he has written this carefully documented and academically valuable study with so easy a grace that his account of Shakespeare in frills and Caroline frippery may be read with delight even by those who are wholly ignorant of Restoration quartos.

This work, which Professor Spencer has completed, badly wanted doing. Various approaches had been made (from a variety of angles) towards a critical and appreciative examination of the peculiarities of these quartos; but no one had attempted to survey the whole field in all its details, no one had endeavoured to write that "exhaustive" history which in other hands might have been exhausting, in Professor Spencer's is exhilarating. In order to set these adaptations in their true light, the author has found it necessary to bring in an amount of subsidiary matter. The first part of his work (over 100 pages) is devoted to the stage history of the plays, and this section contains what is virtually a history of the Restoration stage itself. Then follows a detailed analysis of the independent texts, with a concluding note which presents some "general observations." In the course of these various portions Professor Spencer succeeds in gathering together practically everything in the period which is even remotely connected with Shakespeare. Concerning some of the documentary evidence which he prints, there are, of course, several opinions; I personally cannot subscribe to the enthusiastic benediction given to Lowe's theory concerning a united company in 1660, particularly when the two documents really supporting it have come down to us only at second hand. This, however, is largely a matter of personal interpretation, and it, along with many other similar problemettes in Restoration stage history, will not definitely be settled unless new documentary evidence becomes available. Professor Spencer's analysis of the quartos, on the other hand, has nearly persuaded me out of my original belief that something more lay behind them than ordinary late printed texts, although he has hurried somewhat rapidly over one main argument against him. The 1673 *Macbeth*, as he himself observes, may "represent the play as it was acted even before the Wars" (p. 156), the supposition that the variants in it come from D'Avenant's text being wholly gratuitous. If that be so, then this 1673 Quarto deserves very careful attention from many points of view. It may contain genuine Shakespearian matter, and it may provide a clue to D'Avenant's strange appropriation of some of the King's Men's plays. Professor Spencer has certainly shown that the majority of the alterations in the later plays were apparently made by D'Avenant himself, but one can never be sure that a particular variation may not go back to an earlier date, and this suspicion is certainly strengthened by an examination of the *Macbeth* of 1673.

Whatever views we may hold on individual points, however, we have here a freshly written and carefully prepared survey, containing all the relevant matter excellently arranged. For this all students of Shakespeare and of the Restoration stage must be truly grateful. And to add charm, Professor Spencer has provided some exceedingly interesting illustrations. One of these in particular we have long wished to see—the triple portrait of Lacy as Scruple, Galliard and Sauny (p. 274). Altogether, a good and a valuable book.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL.

*University of London,
East London College.*

Modern English Playwrights, a Short History of the English Drama from 1825. By JOHN W. CUNLIFFE. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1927. 260 pp.

In any history, particularly that of the English drama of the past hundred years, the interest lies, not only in a chronological presentation of facts, but in an explanation of influences and currents of ideas. It is in this respect that Mr. Cunliffe's *Modern English Playwrights* is inadequate. As revealed in part by the chapter headings, which are the names of dramatists in chronological order, and by marginal headings, which are in general the names of plays, the work is episodic, not analytical. The material is rich, but the treatment is faulty.

As a result, I look in vain through the book for an organized discussion of several important subjects. The influence of Ibsen, for example, is treated only incidentally in a few scattered references. The significance of the independent theater, with the new intellectualism in the drama, is barely intimated in three pages preceding a discussion of Stanley Houghton. The one-act play, surely a not unimpressive phenomenon in the recent history of the drama, is ignored. T. W. Robertson, to whose courage as a rebel against the insipidity of the romantic play, Pinero paid a cordial tribute in *Trelawney of the Wells*, is given only one page, in which, by the way, Pinero's recognition of Robertson's genius is not mentioned. The closet drama is almost completely disregarded. And no reference whatever is made to the striking parallel between Hauptmann and Galsworthy—a subject which, I may note in passing, is discussed in an interesting dissertation (1917) by Mr. Walter H. R. Trumbauer of the University of Pennsylvania.

This defective organization of facts in Mr. Cunliffe's work apparently reduced the opportunities for analysis and interpretation to such an extent that it is comparatively slight in this respect.

What views the author expresses in his material are usually sound, with one exception, namely, his explanation of the artificial rhetoric distinctive of the earlier drama of the past century. It cannot be true that the bombast of these plays is due to the tradition of the platform stage of Elizabeth's day. In the first place, the platform stage had long since gone out of existence, and, in the second place, a type of realistic play, without flatulent oratory, had intervened throughout the latter part of the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth centuries. It was not a telescopic remembrance of the Elizabethan stage, but romanticism and sentimentalism that stimulated the sham dialogue of such playwrights as Sheridan Knowles and Bulwer Lytton.

I should raise my voice also against the subtitle of Mr. Cunliffe's book. It should read "History of the English Drama from 1864," not 1825. Aside from an introductory chapter of twenty pages—headed *Introductory* and dealing in generalities—there is nothing about English drama before Robertson's *David Garrick*, 1864, which is the first of the plays listed at the ends of chapters.

As for the catalogue of "Books of General Reference" offered at the end of Mr. Cunliffe's work, I observe that they are, for the most part, only of a general nature; that is, practically all of them are histories of the drama, just as ecumenical in content as Mr. Cunliffe's work. Some books of a more precise character—such an important contribution, for example, as Miss Miriam A. Franc's *Ibsen in England*—should have been included.

In brief, as an acute exposition of the last hundred years' history of the British stage, *Modern English Playwrights* is unsuitable. The facts are abundant enough, but their organization is too ingenuous and their interpretation somewhat thin. As a story, the book is accurate; as a study it is anaemic.

JOHN EARLE UHLER.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Oliver Goldsmith's The Citizen of the World. By HAMILTON JEWETT SMITH. (Yale Studies in English, LXXI), New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926. Pp. 175.

New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith. Edited by R. S. CRANE. The University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. xlii + 147. \$3.00.

A good study of Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World* has long been needed. Mr. Smith's attempt is bound to be useful, since no detailed investigation has heretofore been made of the exact history of its publication, of its relation to the pseudo-letter type, or of its sources. One is grateful for the industry which has compiled

the bibliographical information here supplied, and for the widening of our knowledge of Goldsmith's sources which Mr. Smith indubitably effects. The book as a whole, however, is unsatisfactory, attempting too much, and failing to achieve definitive results in what it attempts. Amateurishness of method appears in the failure to verify definite clues given by Goldsmith himself. For instance, the whole section which examines Goldsmith's indebtedness to DuHalde's *History of China* is invalidated by the use of the wrong translation of that book—R. Brooke's translation, published by J. Watts, 4 vols. octavo—although Goldsmith states in three separate footnotes that he is using the folio edition (Guthrie and Green's translation for Edward Cave, 2 vols., folio), and gives volume and page for his text. As a result, the three important verbatim quotations go unnoticed, and the accuracy of all his positive conclusions becomes open to question. Contrarily, Mr. Smith takes Goldsmith too completely at his word, when he labels the essay on Taste in *The Bee* as a translation of Voltaire's article, "Gout," in the *Dictionnaire Philosophique*. The latter part of Goldsmith's essay is drawn from the preceding article on "Esprit." Another illustration of carelessness is seen in Mr. Smith's inexplicable failure to recognize Goldsmith's "Letter from a Common Councilman," which he found reprinted from the *Public Ledger* in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and took to be an attempt to parody Goldsmith's style. The book is further marred by numerous textual and typographical errors. It is regrettable that a book with such large possibilities of usefulness should so lay itself open to censure.

Professor Crane's book adds definitely to the Goldsmith canon eighteen hitherto unidentified essays. For such a service, every student of literature will be grateful.

In the useful introduction, Professor Crane gives first a history of the successive desultory attempts at collecting the unacknowledged periodical writing of Goldsmith, then a justification for his own attempt in the same field, with a careful definition of the means by which he has decided on the authenticity of the essays he here presents, and third an overly deprecatory appraisal of the literary value of his discoveries. The most interesting portion is naturally the description of his method. Here he emphatically rejects the intuitive test of style, as unscholarly and discredited, and states his belief in the eventual emergence of tests which will be scientifically demonstrable. Lacking these, he was obliged to use two less exact tests,—Goldsmith's established connection with the periodicals from which the essays were culled, and his well-known peculiar habit of echoing himself, his ideas as well as his phrases.

In the appendix the editor gives a description of various essays in which some evidence of Goldsmith's authorship may be found, but for which the proofs are not conclusive enough to be final. The

uncertainty expressed about the group of Lives of the Fathers from the *Christian Magazine* can perhaps be dissipated by reference to Newbery's separate publication of the Lives, credited to Goldsmith at the time of their publication, a copy of which is now in the possession of Mr. R. W. Seitz of Yale University.

Professor Crane has combined effectively a wide knowledge of Goldsmith's writings with a convincing method, which he has applied with a moderation and precision which cannot be too highly praised. The reader lays down the book with only one question. Is it possible that the editor places as little faith as he would have us believe in the power of an adequately equipped critic to detect the characteristic note of an author, where that note is roundly and clearly sounded? To this unregenerate reviewer, all of Professor Crane's careful argument became almost supererogatory for those essays in which appear such passages as, let us say, this remark about the current magazines, in Essay XVII: "The smallness of the type, however, shut out two classes of readers to whom they might have been otherwise very serviceable, children learning to read, and old women who read with spectacles." Conversely, if the style of any essay had seemed entirely uncharacteristic of the known manner of Goldsmith, would the essay not have to be rejected, in spite of an array of parallel resemblances? No such essay, however, appears in the collection.

K. C. BALDERSTON.

Wellesley College.

The History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith. By
KATHERINE C. BALDERSTON. Cambridge University Press,
1926. 61 pp.

The Bishop of Dromore never became fully reconciled to Thomas Percy, the man of letters. Episcopal vocation and literary avocations often found themselves at odds. The bishop continued to depreciate Mr. Percy's *Reliques* and gave only furtive countenance to association with writers of comedies. In his early years Percy was a connoisseur of the curious and the elegant; in his later years he almost permitted to slip from his fingers one of the most curious and elegant of the human phenomena of the eighteenth century. Yet he saved the Folio Manuscript from the fire; and he rescued much of what remains of the personality of Goldsmith. A reading of such an early memoir as that of Glover, reprinted as late as 1813 by a Philadelphia editor as the "best" life of Goldsmith, invites indulgent judgment on Percy's lifting his hand from the clerical plow long enough to do his part in preparing the mundane writer's biography.

Miss Balderston's book is devoted to tracing the devious history of the *Memoir* of Goldsmith inserted in the *Miscellaneous Works* of 1801, to determining what share Percy had in the composition and editing of the *Memoir*, and to discovering in detail the sources of Percy's information. We find here the memorandum—now printed in full for the first time—dictated by Goldsmith to Percy in 1773, briefly rehearsing the principal events in the poet's life. There follows a closely knit sketch of Percy's later connection with the undertaking and of his final severance from it before the day of publication; this account rests upon the generally known data and upon a considerable body of hitherto unpublished documents and of circumstances not before linked into the chain of evidence. The book concludes with a minute annotation of the successive items in the *Memoir*, indicating the probable origin of the separate memorabilia.

In certain cases Miss Balderston has not found it possible to run the quarry to earth. Too often, where documentation is imperatively wanted, *Cetera desunt*. Such vacancies in the record, indeed the entire array of both negative and positive findings in her *History* stresses the need of a fresh treatment of Goldsmith's life. Miss Balderston's subsequently published *Census of the Manuscripts of Oliver Goldsmith* (1926) lends further persuasion. Goldsmith's surviving papers form a slender sheaf. The Percy manuscripts of the British Museum, together with those in the possession of Miss Meade and others, are much more numerous and have not yet been systematically utilised. A new life of Percy may well be prerequisite to a comprehensive biography of Goldsmith. Biographers, in either case, will turn to the *History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith*.

S. B. HUSTVEDT.

University of California at Los Angeles.

Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne. ÉMILE PONS. Oxford University Press, American Branch. New York, 1925. Pp. 160. \$1.20.

Mr. Pons begins his interesting and suggestive study by defining the term "Anglo-Saxon." Obviously, if we are to know what he is writing about, we must first of all be told what he means by *la poésie anglo-saxonne*. His compatriot, Mr. Paul Descamps, uses *anglo-saxon* in the sense "modern English."¹ Mr. Pons, however,

¹ *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, I, 479 ff.; II, 524 ff. Similarly the German writer L. Feuchtwanger, to whom *Anglo-Saxon literature* means "modern English and American literature." See the *Literary Digest*, Jan. 7, 1928, p. 25.

uses it in the sense "Old English." He apologizes for this usage (which, as he says, is *un peu démodé dans ce sens*), but pleads that the term "Old English" is *d'un maniérement malaisé en français*. If he is right here, the French must have a hard time indeed, what with such terms as Old French, Old Irish, Old Norse, Old Saxon and Old High German in addition to the troublesome Old English; perhaps the linguistic difficulty explains their comparative neglect of the mediæval field. But however that may be, it is certainly unfortunate that Mr. Pons has included in the title of his book a term so vague that it may refer to any period of English literature from the good year 600 to the present day. We must not infer, however, from Mr. Pons's terminology that he follows Mr. Legouis in excluding OE literature from English. On the contrary, he recognizes and even stresses the solidarity of mediæval English literary tradition. Thus, of the *Gawain* poet he says (pp. 153 f.), *c'est lui . . . qui nous apparaît comme le dernier et le plus pur représentant, en cette seconde partie du moyen âge, du lyrisme anglo-saxon de la nature.*

Mr. Pons's work falls into six chapters. Of these, the first three deal with the hackneyed problem of distinguishing the Christian from the heathen elements in OE poetry. In Chapter IV, the author dissects the OE *sentiment de la nature* into three chief elements: *sentiment chrétien de la mort, réalisme, esprit mythique*. Chapter V is devoted to other elements of less weight. Chapter VI sums up the whole: *le sentiment de la nature . . . c'est lui qui, en dépit des influences étrangères, réparaît, sous sa forme originale, dans le plus haut lyrisme anglais de tous les temps* (p. 156).

The analysis which the author gives us is interesting and suggestive, as I have said, but the thesis quoted from Chapter VI remains unproved. And the difficulty lies, I think, in the nature of the case. Mr. Pons has looked at OE literature from a certain point of view, and has drawn his conclusions. But it is possible to look at the same material from other points of view, and to draw other conclusions, equally valid. Mr. Pons's realism may be another's romanticism, and yet another's conventionality. In particular, I am skeptical of some of the *survivances païennes* set forth in Chapter III. Thus, the superstitions reflected in OE literature are hardly fragments of an earlier mythical edifice, but represent rather a sturdy world of popular belief as little touched by the higher heathen cults as by the Christianity which overthrew those cults.

The author makes some unfortunate mistakes of an elementary kind. Thus, we are told (p. 8) of *le discours de Heremod sur la destinée de l'homme* and (p. 23) of the dragon Fenrir. I must object, moreover, to the whole passage in which Mr. Pons discusses the date of *Beowulf*. He says (p. 6) that *Beowulf* is nowadays

looked upon as having been *composé tardivement* (*peut-être à la fin du IX^e siècle?*) and cites not only Schücking but also Klaeber as his authorities. But Klaeber (*Beowulf*, p. cxvi) in fact puts the composition of the poem in the first half of the eighth century, and this is still the usual dating, in spite of Schücking's heterodox views. Thus A. S. Cook says,² "the prevailing opinion places the composition of *Beowulf* not far from 700."

KEMP MALONE.

Barock und Rokoko in der deutschen Dichtung. Von EMIL ERMATINGER. (Gewalten und Gestalten Bd. 4) Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1926.

Dies Buch ist schon rein äußerlich charakterisiert durch die bewundernswürdige Leistung einer Konzentration, mit der es eine zweihundertjährige Entwicklung auf 179 Seiten zusammendrängt ohne Einbuße an Klarheit und Sinnfälligkeit. Es entwickelt die These, daß vom sechzehnten Jahrhundert an zwei Stränge der Aufklärung, ein geistlich-religiöser und ein weltlich-wissenschaftlicher, zuerst nebeneinander herlaufen, und zwar getrennt, der erste in Deutschland und der andere in außerdeutschen Ländern, und dann sich im achzehnten Jahrhundert in Deutschland durchdringen. Verselbständigung des Denkens, Lockerung und Flüssigmachung des orthodoxen Geistesgrundes, Erschütterung der Dogmatik ist nach Ermatinger eben auch Aufklärung, nämlich eine metaphysisch-religiöse, wie sie sich in der Barockspannung dokumentiert: dem 'Sich-Emporringen der Weltlust und Diesseitsfüchtigkeit gegen den schweren Druck des Weltleidens und der Jenseitsbereitschaft, und umgekehrt, der gewaltsamen Hemmung und Weltbejahung durch die Diesseitsverneinung in einer letzten, höchsten Steigerung' (p. 24).

Descartes' *Traité des passions de l'âme* (1649) mit seinem Zwiespalt von Leidenschaft und Vernunft und die stoische Beherrschung und Klärung der Leidenschaften leiten die Zersetzung dieser Barockepoche ein mit dem Anfang psychologischen Interesses in Lohenstein und Hofmannswaldau.

Das Rokoko dagegen ist charakterisiert durch das menschliche Ordnungsvermögen der Ratio. Es ist wohl kein Zufall, daß ein Schweizer diesem ordnenden Prinzip gerechter werden und das Verdienst Calvins nach Gebühr würdigen konnte, während man in Deutschland von jeher dem Rationalismus in einer gewissen Mißtrauens- und Abwehrstellung gegenüberstand. Ermatinger sieht, daß der Irrationalismus des Barock seelenvertiefend, aber auch seelenzersetzend wirkt, und betont die sammelnde, auf-

² *Trans. Conn. Acad. Arts and Sciences*, xxvii, 395.

bauende und zielsetzende Kraft der Vernunftrichtung, die von Calvin über Spinoza, Shaftesbury bis zum psychologischen Materialismus verläuft, zu Naturrecht und Naturreligion führt und zur Entwicklungsidee, in der Geschichte als ein Aufstieg zu größerer Reinheit und Einheit mit Gott erscheint (Johannes Koch in Leiden). Aber auch der Pietismus verlegt den Sinn des Christentums in psychologisches und sittliches Gebiet, 'die Mystik und der Rationalismus, so wesensverschieden sie scheinen, stehen im Grund einander näher, als man meint: was sie eint, ist bei beiden die Mißachtung der Welt der natürlichen Erscheinungen und die innere Dialektik des reinen Geistes' (p. 99).

Mit Leibniz ist dann die Dynamik der Vernunft und die Individuation alles Lebens erreicht; der Entwicklungsgedanke als Wesensidee der Aufklärung wird lebendig: Streben aus der Dummheit bloßer Empfindung in die Klarheit bewußter Erkenntnis der Welt, fortschreitende Erhellung der Welt und Vervollkommenung ihres Zustandes. Christian Wolff bedeutet gedanklich einen Rückschritt durch seine Entwirklachung Leibnizischer Gedanken, die Schweizer dagegen—häufig mißverstanden—erkennen den irrationalen Wesensgrund der Dichtung.

Diese kurze Zusammenfassung des Buches gibt ein sehr unvollkommenes Bild des hier Geleisteten; denn Ermatinger abstrahiert nicht nur, er belebt—es ist das wirklich eine erstaunliche Leistung—individuelle Gestalten, hebt besonders charakteristische Stellen in treffender Wahl aus ihren Schriften und beleuchtet auch vorweisend durch suggestive Wortgebung bereits weite Strecken des noch übrigen Weges: man glaubt oft Prolegomena zu einer Fausterklärung zu lesen. Nicht genannt und dennoch geahnt steht am Ende dieses Weges der Große, dem es gelingt, die geistigen Kraftströme zweier Jahrhunderte auf seine Mühle zu schlagen.

ERNST FEISE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

L'Europe littéraire (1833-34)—*un essai de périodique littéraire.*

Par THOMAS R. PALFREY. Paris, Champion, 1927. Pp. vi + 188.

Dr. Palfrey's dissertation, which is volume XXXII of the *Bibliothèque de la RLC.*, is a careful examination of *l'Europe littéraire*, an ephemeral periodical of which 107 issues appeared from March 1, 1833 to Feb. 6, 1834. Its importance lies in its exceeding rarity at present, for P. has found only one complete collection, that of Spoelberch de Lovenjoul at Chantilly. It has been virtu-

ally inaccessible to students of the period, but P. gives such exact information as to the aims, contents and collaborators of the journal that it is now unnecessary to go to its files for this knowledge. The 8 chapters of the dissertation give a satisfactory account of the brief history of *l'Europe littéraire*, its rivals in the journalistic field, its editors and principal collaborators, its foreign relations, its contributions to literary and art criticisms, and its place in the Romantic movement, of which it was a militant champion. Hugo, Nodier, and Balzac contributed to its pages hitherto unpublished writings; most important among these are chapter I of *Eugénie Grandet* and the "Veillée" of the *Médecin de campagne*. Among the foreign contributors were Heine and Immermann; English literature is represented chiefly by two articles on Tennyson; the United States are snubbed with the rather sneering remark that "son ère intellectuelle n'a pas encore sonné." All in all, a rather fragmentary literary baggage of little merit. The main justification for so detailed a study is that the journal did, at the outset, have a "lofty conception of its rôle" as medium for the spread of mutual understanding and good-will in the artistic world of its day.

Perhaps the most valuable section of the work is the *Index analytique de l'Europe littéraire* and three appendices, which occupy considerably more actual space than does the study itself. The *Index* gives a complete table of contents of the periodical; the appendices include much information about the journal, its patrons, and its collaborators, with bio-bibliographical material on these latter. The study has clearly been prepared in a very painstaking manner and is endowed with an air of finality. Attention should be called to what seems an erroneous statement, on the part of the author, to the effect that the editors of *l'Europe littéraire*, contrary to their promise to exclude politics rigorously from their journal, had decided, by the end of 1833, to champion the cause of the Church and the Bourbons. "Victor Hugo et Balzac,"¹ we read, "les deux rédacteurs principaux, partageaient alors (nous sommes en 1833) les idées religieuses de la direction." To speak of Hugo as a Legitimist in 1833, after his *volte-face* between August 14, 1829 and August 7, 1830, is inaccurate.² Hugo's name must be here left out of consideration and the esteem in which he was held by the editors of *l'Europe littéraire* explained on other grounds than his supposed loyalty to the Legitimist party.

AARON SCHAFFER.

University of Texas.

¹ P. 51.

² Vide Edmond Biré: *Victor Hugo après 1830* (Paris, Perrin, 1891, pp. 1 et seq.)

Bibliographie des œuvres de Gérard de Nerval. By ARISTIDE MARIE.

Paris: Champion, 1926.

The critical edition of the works of Gérard de Nerval, the publication of which has recently been undertaken by M. Edouard Champion, has been inaugurated by a methodical bibliography, in which the editions of his numerous writings have been arranged in chronological order. The work of compiling a bibliography of Gérard de Nerval was by no means an easy task. His verses, stories, translations, criticisms, and dramatic fragments are, for the most part, scattered in a great number of periodicals, many of which long ago ceased to be published and have become by now difficult of access. Moreover, Nerval had the habit of publishing his writings under various pseudonyms and, to a certain extent, anonymously so that it is often difficult to determine their authorship with any degree of certainty.

The bibliography under review is preceded by a critical study on the history of the works of Nerval and is interspersed by reproductions of the title-pages of their original editions. The alphabetical list of critical, biographical, and bibliographical books and articles written about Nerval, which is printed at the end of the volume, is, with few exceptions, limited to material written in French.¹ The compiler lays no claim to completeness, but maintains that he took great pains, with the aid of other admirers of Nerval, to unearth as much as he could of all that has so far been written on his literary idol, of whom he is the acknowledged biographer. It is greatly to be regretted, though, that he is unfamiliar with Thieme's *Guide bibliographique*, which would have furnished him an additional dozen items. In addition to those there mentioned may be listed: *Gérard de Nerval*, (*De la Connais-sance des livres*, fascicule 5.) 1886; Edmond Jaloux, *Gérard de Nerval, ses amours, sa folie, sa mort*, Paris, Editions d'Art, n. d.; Pierre Audiati, *L' "Aurélia" de Gérard de Nerval*, Paris, Champion, 1925; and two interesting articles, both of which appeared in 1923, the first in the Berlin periodical *Die Literatur* (successor to the *Literarisches Echo*), and the second in the *North-American Review* under the title: "Backwaters of Romanticism."

Of foreign translation, the compiler of the bibliography under review mentions only, as a curiosity perhaps, a Russian version of *Le Prince des sots*, which appeared in 1889. No English or German translations are given. It may be well to refer to an English version of *Les filles du feu* by James Whitall (London,

¹ The pagination given for periodicals is often incorrect.

1924) and especially to an English adaptation of the dramatic fragment of *Nicolas Flamel* by Seamus O'Sullivan, who added the last scene (*The Dublin Magazine*, I, (1923/24), 503-12).

MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN.

Baker University.

A Grammar of the Dialect of Penrith (Cumberland). Descriptive and Historical, with Specimens and a Glossary. By PERCY H. REANEY. Manchester, London, New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1927. Pp. xv + 215.

The greater part of his material, the author informs us in the Preface, was gathered during two years of residence in Penrith, 1912-1913, though it has been added to and checked during later visits. The author is himself a Northerner, but nevertheless often found it difficult to understand what he heard when listening to Penrith farmers; and it was this that first led him to study the dialect. There have been other earlier studies made of Cumbrian of more isolated places than that dealt with here. Penrith is rather accessible, and the inroads that Standard English has made on local speech are seen here on every page. The author has known how to secure genuine dialectal forms and pronunciation; and he shows wide knowledge of the scientific literature on English dialects, the history of Standard English, and of the closely related languages a knowledge of which is so essential for such a study. I miss information on some points, and I can not always agree with him (there are many things in the difficult and complex vernaculars of Northwestern England that are capable of different explanations); but on the whole the work has been very well done, and the results are a real contribution to English.

Many years ago I visited the not distant village of Keswick, and gathered some material for a certain purpose then in hand. Reading this book, I have been struck with the ripidity of changes that have been going on during the last twenty-five years. Mr. Reaney, however, remarks that 'Even to-day educated Cumbrians are bilingual, and their pride and interest in their native tongue and its literature will preserve it for generations to come.' But Joseph Wright wrote in the Preface to his *English Dialect Grammar* in 1905, that had that work been delayed another twenty years he believed that "it would by then be quite impossible to get together sufficient pure dialectal material to enable one to give a mere outline of the phonology of our dialects as they existed at the close of the XIXth century" (p. vii). Penrith has gone far toward this state of disintegration. One can observe here, as perhaps in few

localities in Northern England, how a dialect that some thirty or forty years ago was a fairly pure local vernacular has become colored in all parts of its grammar, and in its pronunciation, by the influence of Standard Speech. And we can see the process going on: how a historically and regularly developed word-form that was in general use then is now rarely heard, 'only used by old persons' (and children); how 'pure dialect' words are disappearing. And herein lies, perhaps, the chief value of Reaney's study: it gives us a most interesting picture of such a mixed dialect in the making. I say purposely 'a mixed dialect in the making,' for it must not be supposed that what is going on is a rapid change from pure Cumbrian to Standard Speech. When one observes carefully the nature of the changes that are going on, one will, I think, be inclined to agree with the author; it will be many generations before Cumbrians will speak Standard. For, if many words from the latter are coming in, likewise parts of paradigms, there are also other things that are happening. The words of St. Sp. are being taken over, but dialectal influence gives them a different vowel (or consonant) perhaps; a phonologically correct dialect form is by dialectal analogy replaced by an entirely different one. Nothing illustrates better the vitality of the dialects of Cumberland, and even this very mixed example, than such things as these. For example: the adjective *na:* 'near,'¹ comp. *na:r*, superl. *na:rəst*, *nekst*, and *niást* (§ 482). How much is 'traditional,' 'genuine,' 'correct' here? Surely only the comparative *na:r* (i.e. in this part of Cumberland). The Old Anglian *nēh* (OE *nēah*) would have given us [ni:], but this has been replaced by the form [na:] of the comparative. In the superlative the regularly developed form would be [ni: st], as it was a generation ago in the same region of Cumberland, and in adjacent northern Westmoreland (and still is in some places). But this has been modified to [niást], probably by influence of [miást], superlative of [mutf]. However, even [niást] is rare; the commonest form is [na: rəst], another dialectal analogical form. Finally [nekst] is used, and this is clearly St. Eng. *next*.

Again, in the first class of strong verbs: the verb [straik], 'to strike,' pret. [struk], pprte. [struk] is in no part of it influenced by St. Eng. *straik-* *str^hk*—*str^hk*. The infinitive [straik] is correct for this dialect (as Reaney shows, § 185), the other two forms should be [striák, strikn]. These have been replaced by influence of Class II ([bind-bund-bund]). However [raid, rait], and [raiz],² are regular: [riád, ridn, riát, ritn], and [riaz, rizn]; [raid], and [raiz] have preserved both pret. vowel forms: [riád], and [rid];

¹ a: = long a of *father*.

² Ride, write, and rise.

[riáz] and [riz]. But with [draiv], ‘to drive’ we have a ‘mixed’ condition again; the forms are [draiv—driáv, drɔ:v,—drivn, drovn, druvn]. Here is one St. Eng. form: [dr v], ‘drove.’ But, as we see, this is not pronounced *drov*; or *drouv*; the form [dr v], is better Penrithian, it is the Northern [ɔ:] instead of the Southern *ou* (o^u).

I do not think that the author has always succeeded in making these things sufficiently clear. He has sometimes offered an equation of sounds or a derivation which has seemed doubtful to me, because it contradicts the regular Penrithian development of the sound in like environment. Thus under OE. *aeg*, § 113, the Penrith equivalent is [iá], as [niál], ‘nail,’ [briáns], ‘brains,’ unless followed by *r*, or when final, in which case it becomes [ɛ], as [dɛ:] ‘day,’ and [fer:], ‘fair.’ But under the examples of [-iá-], there is a note which says: [ɛ:] is now often heard: [breñs, ‘brains,’ [dɛ: zi], ‘daisy.’ Are we to infer then that the sound [ɛ] here is due to the cases with [ɛ]? To me it seems clear that *brens* and *dezi* are simply borrowings from Standard speech. Further, in § 170, we see that OE. ā, when final becomes [iə], as [niə], ‘no,’ [tiə], ‘toe,’ [twiə], ‘two.’ Then a note says: “We still hear in Penrith [ga:] ‘to go,’ [ga: z] ‘goes’ . . . ‘Old people still use the obsolescent form [twa:] two.’ But how are these forms to be understood (in a dialect of southern Cumberland)? Wyld, *A Short History of English* (third ed., 1927, § 225, § 157), has shown that northern ME. ā was fronted to ē by the XIVth century. The form [twiə] is, of course absolutely regular. But the note seems to be intended to say that old people still preserve the original form *twā* (by the side of the form that came from *twāē*). However, in § 13 the author suggests that the sound *a:* (open mixed lax unrounded) which only occurs in five words (that are listed) “is probably due to the influence of the Westmoreland dialect”; and among the words listed are [ga:] and [twa:]. Similarly under OE *ēag*, Anglian *ēh*, § 209, we are told that this has become [ai] in Penrith, and the examples given are [aiz], eyes, and [dai], ‘to dye.’ Thereupon the obsolescent form [i:], ‘eye,’ [i: n], ‘eyes,’ is noted, and it is concluded that the *ai*-forms are “evidently loans from standard English.” It must be rather certain that they are; and hence also, that the fact is that OE *ēa*, also in the combinations *ēah* and *ēag*, has become [i:] in Penrith (and that the form [fleɪ], ‘flea’ is to be otherwise explained).

I shall also note the following matters:

§ 66. “ME. *a + g* < Scand. *a, ö* (ø) + *gg*.” The ö, as a special XIIIth century Icelandic development of ø, should be omitted.

§ 67. Of the nineteen sources of Penrith [ɛ] those of numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 14 are from *a:* apparently regularly if the group dental + another consonant immediately follows. The exceptions to this seem limited and capable of explanation.

§ 107. “[tʃan] (echoic word, *NED.*) a method of talk, patois (derog.).” I suggest comparison with Norw. dial. *kjangla*, ‘to quarrel’ (‘kjævles,’ says Aasen).

§ 332. “Scandinavian *v* has become [w: wa:r], ‘worse,’ etc. But the Scandinavian sound at the time of borrowing was *w*. And then also:

§ 334. In discussing the OE and OS combination *wr*, it is noted that *w* remained until late in the nineteenth century, then “and still appears as *v* in the Aberdeen district (*vran*, ‘wrong,’ *vrit*, ‘write.’ Here it is no doubt not intended to equate Aberdeenshire *vrang* directly with Scand *vrang*.

§ 338. “*f* survives from Scand. *pt*: [lopt] ‘loft,’ etc. It might have been best to add that the *p* in such words as ON *lopt* (also spelled *loft*) was at the time of borrowing a voiceless bilabial spirant.

§ 386. Perhaps the word [skelp] in Penrith and elsewhere in Cumberland) is not from Scand. *skelfa*, ‘to strike with the hand,’ and later influenced by Gaelic. *sgeilp*, ‘a stroke,’ but simply the latter word used (both as noun? and) as a verb.

§ 420. It is difficult to see what is meant by the statements: “An initial [k] has arisen before [r] in [kran/], ‘to crunch.’ Cf. 16th cent. Du. *schranzen*, ‘to break,’ ‘tear,’ MHG. *schranz*, ‘breach,’ ‘split,’ Mod. Du. *schranzen*, ‘to eat voraciously.’ Onomatopoeic modification of *crash*, *cranch* (*scranch* or *crunch*) between the teeth.” Then follow references to such variant forms as *crab* and *scrab*, *NED.* I take it that what is meant is that Penrith [cran/] is from MDu. *schranzen*, with loss of initial *s*, so that now we have initial *kr* for older *skr*. This would seem to be correct, but it does not sufficiently explain things. There should have been some mention made of the very general and wide-spread opposite tendency in English dialects of forming doublets with initial *sc*(*sk*), to words with original *k*, as *sker*, ‘left-handed,’ and *car*; *pink* and *spink*, etc. See the long list of such in *Wright*, § 323. Naturally this sort of a thing would also lead to doublets of words having original *sk*, especially in certain regions. [Kran/] would seem to be such a case.

But I do not wish to seem to be finding fault with a good study, undertaken after a great deal of careful work, and carried out with industry and scholarship. The matters spoken of are minor faults that do not mar much the usefulness of the book. It is an excellent feature that in the description of the sounds, and tables of OE sources, pp. 3-24, phonology of the vowels, pp. 24-88, and the consonants, pp. 88-135, accidence, pp. 136-172, specimens of the dialect, pp. 172-177, and the glossary, pp. 179-214, every Penrith dialect word is recorded in transcription.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

University of Illinois.

RECENT WORKS ON PROSE FICTION BEFORE 1800

Among the works published in 1927 concerning the history of prose fiction before 1800, the most generally important is *The Light Reading of Our Ancestors: Chapters on the Growth of the English Novel* (Brentano). Its author, Rowland Edmund Prothero, Lord Ernle, best known as the editor of *Byron*, has for more than sixty years been a devoted reader of the prose fiction of former generations. Forty years ago he began to publish articles thereon, which now would fill more than three volumes. These studies he has condensed into one volume. Although the author himself would deprecate the claim, this book will probably be regarded as a history of English fiction from its beginnings to Sir Walter Scott. Indeed, in a few particulars, it is a nearer approach to a good history of that subject than any other book. In two respects especially it deserves the highest praise: it is based upon the sources themselves, that is to say, upon a wide reading of the prose fiction from the earliest times; and the choice of the reading has been determined not by the author's personal likings alone, but by a sincere desire to discover what were the likings of "our ancestors." Some of our histories of prose fiction do justice only to such novels as their modern authors themselves found still interesting; but Lord Ernle has read much which he himself must have found dull, in a patient effort to determine why his forbears delighted therein. Some of his chapters therefore describe, from first-hand knowledge, once popular works now almost forgotten. This is especially true of his accounts of the fiction of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Such a chapter as, for example, "A Book-Box of Novels (1689-1724)," describes at first hand works like *Cynthia*, *The History of Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Essex*, *The Irish Rogue*, *The Siege of Mentz*, and *Lindamira*, for mention of which the student will look in vain in other brief accounts. Lord Ernle has also read sympathetically although critically, the forgotten novels of the latter part of the eighteenth century.

The literary criticism, moreover, is on the whole admirably sound. Lord Ernle's wide interest in many aspects of life and letters, his travels, his expert knowledge of non-literary pursuits such as agriculture, have enlarged his sympathies and prevented his judgment from being narrowly bookish; while his studies in such widely different literary works as the Psalms, the works of Gibbon, and the poetry of Byron, have broadened his taste. His chapters upon Petronius and Apuleius, particularly the latter, are remarkably fine pieces of criticism; and his appreciation of Fielding is, in my opinion, one of the best brief introductions to the personality and works of that novelist. I am inclined to believe that none of

the short histories contains as useful an introductory account of the period from 1580-1719.

Since the merits of Lord Ernle's work will, in spite of his modest disclaimer, give his readers the impression that it is an adequate history of prose fiction, it is necessary to point out its limitations. In the choice of authors and topics treated, there are grave inconsistencies. It was well to give space to such foreign works as the Greek Romances, Petronius, Apuleius, Boccaccio, D'Urfé, Mme. de La Fayette, and Scarron; but a distorted view of foreign influences is conveyed by the omission or neglect of such equally important works as *Cyropaedia*, *Lazarillo*, *The Arabian Nights*, *Contes de Ma Mère L'Oye*, and *Gil Blas*. The list of medieval prose fictions is very seriously defective: nothing is said of the Saints' Legends, nor of the exempla; Geoffrey of Monmouth is grossly neglected; and there is no account of *Apollonius of Tyre*, *Reynard the Fox*, the *Ancren Riwle*, or *Fulk Fitz-Warine*. The description and discussion of the prose tales of the sixteenth century, and of the jest books, is inadequate; there is nothing or too little concerning *Robert the Devil*, *Helyas*, *Vergilius*, and *Hamblet*. The only mention of More's *Utopia* is a casual one in the chapter on Richardson. For these reasons alone, Lord Ernle's book cannot take the place of reasonably comprehensive sketches of the history of prose fiction such as Professor Saintsbury's or Professor Cross's.

The work has no bibliography. Indeed it is evident that Lord Ernle is but slightly acquainted with modern research in the history of prose fiction. Of American contributions he seems entirely unaware. Consequently he omits mention of historically so significant works as Grange's *Golden Aphroditis* and Kirkman's *Counterfeit Lady*; and he repeats the old errors that Mrs. Behn was in Surinam, and that Defoe wrote *The Storm* while in jail. The chapter on Defoe is remarkably weak, making no use of the light which American scholars have shed upon Defoe's sources and methods. In general, Lord Ernle is better in describing the nature of the fictions he deals with than in disclosing their provenience and manner of composition. The book is an excellent illustration of the truth that is impossible to write a good history of prose fiction nowadays without dependence upon the labors of other scholars.

The chief doctrine of Lord Ernle's work is that the main tendency in prose fiction has been "the gradual growth of the perception that truth to life is the aim of novelists." Lord Ernle tends to appreciate the merits of realistic fictions more than the merits of romances, a preference somewhat dangerous when dealing with a genre in which the romantic and fantastic down to our own days have flourished as much as the realistic and naturalistic.

Comparatively little work appeared during 1927 on the prose fiction of the Middle Ages. Professor Gerould emphasized anew

that what Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote was essentially what we should to-day term, I suppose, an historical novel with a political tendency.¹

Professor T. Atkinson Jenkins' presidential address before the Modern Language Association, *On Newness in the Novel*, carefully traced the history of the word *novella* up to Boccaccio. He showed that in Old French and Provençal as well as in Italian the tendency was to understand by that word a tale with a memorable saying or witty retort; and that in the *Decameron* twenty tales are of that type, while dialogue is prominent in all of them. This is a real contribution to the origins of the modern idea of the novel. There is need, as Professor Jenkins remarked, of a thorough study of the history of dialogue.

Erasmus, despite the *Praise of Folly* (translated in 1549), and despite his fondness for introducing fictitious narrative into other works of his, has been persistently ignored by historians of prose fiction. His contributions to the genre, and his influence upon it, have also been neglected by his biographers. An opportunity to be the first to give him his just dues in this connection was therefore open to John Joseph Mangan, M. D., in his two-volume *Life, Character, and Influence of Desiderius Erasmus*. Dr. Mangan describes the *Praise of Folly* and the *Colloquies* at great length, but shows no interest in their literary character. He is preoccupied with a medical interpretation of Erasmus' temperament, and especially with a sectarian defense of his church against Erasmus' satires upon ecclesiastical evils. He seems unaware of those changes in taste and in manners which the critic of older literature must not forget. His zeal prompts him to term the *Praise of Folly*,—one of the great liberalizing masterpieces of humanism,—“this inconsequent and silly, not to say blasphemous work,” and to opine that “Erasmus was not normal when he wrote it, and still less so when he published it.” What he stresses in the *Colloquies* is their alleged “monacophobia” and “obscenities.” “The tone of his work,” we are told, “was essentially lewd in parts. . . . This moral obliquity in Erasmus is astonishing, and can only be explained on the theory that he was born with a moral strabismus.”² This unsavory union of the bigoted with the clinical can hardly result in enlightenment.

Professor N. H. Clement, who recently published a study of the form of Rabelais' romance, has now analyzed its philosophy in a cautious and painstaking article, “The Eclecticism of Rabelais”

¹ *Speculum*, II, 33-51.—See Professor Nitze's comment thereon in the same volume, 317-321; and Professor A. C. L. Brown's, 449-455.—Professor J. J. Parry finds the source of the name Lucius in *Josephus*; *ibid.*, II, 446-447.—All books and articles referred to in this survey are of 1927 unless otherwise stated.

² Mangan, J. J.; *Erasmus* (Macmillan) I, 312; II, 138, 148, 149.

(*PLMA.*, XLII, 339-384). The dispute about Rabelais' meaning is very old. It even appears, in a vulgar form, in the pages of Tom Brown of facetious memory, who has Rabelais speaking of his own works as "things which some call a cock and a bull, and others the product of a lively imagination." Differing with Faguet, who doubted whether Rabelais had any philosophy at all; as well as with Abel Lefranc, who believed that he had one, and that it was anti-religious and materialistic; Professor Clement finds Rabelais' thought in process of development from the first two books to the last three. (He holds that most, if not all, of the fifth book is authentic.) The development, as he sees it, is from Epicureanism, coarsened by hedonism, towards "a theory of life and the universe prevailingly Stoical." This seems the most plausible and best documented interpretation thus far published.

What we stand greatly in need of are careful editions of the sixteenth-century translations of foreign fictions. Especially welcome, therefore, is Peter Davies' valuable reprint of *Thirteene Most Pleasant and Delectable Questions, entituled a Disport of Diverse Voble Personages, Englished anno 1566 by H. G.* This translation of a long episode in Boccaccio's *Filocopo* marked an important step in the progress of Italian influence. (In passing, I may remark that it would furnish Professor Jenkins, whose article I mentioned above, with additional evidence regarding the importance of dialogue.) The present edition, furnished with an introduction by Edward Hutton, who edited the 1587 translation of *Amorous Fiametta* a year ago, is limited to 520 copies, printed in a fount reconstructed from Peter Schoeffer's ancient fount, so that its pages by their appearance as well as by their contents suggest the dawn of Elizabethan fiction.

F. C. Danchin, in "Les deux Arcadies de Sir Philip Sidney" (*Revue Anglo-américaine*, v, 39-52) tries to mediate between those who admire the *Old Arcadia* more than the *New* and those who do not. He feels that the *Old* is superior to the *New* in the simple straightforwardness of Books I and II, but the *New* superior in Book III, with its heroic note. This is confessedly impressionistic. His remarks would have been sounder on the contents of the *Arcadia* if he had read Greenlaw in the *Kittredge Anniversary Papers*; and on the form and style if he had read what Wolff, Harrison, and others have discovered concerning Sidney's models.—The remarkable fact that the *Arcadia*, although not translated into French until 1624, became the basis of a French play as early as 1605, is brilliantly proved by Professor H. C. Lancaster (*MLN.*, XLII, 2). This gives Sidney and prose fiction the leadership in introducing English influence into French literature.

The important Bunyan item of 1927 is Professor John W. Draper's "Bunyan's Mr. Ignorance" (*Modern Language Review*, xxii,

15-27). It shows that Mr. Ignorance expressed Bunyan's Calvinistic hostility to the type of person who was self-satisfied, who, Quaker-like, had no consciousness of sin, who felt himself good at heart, and who was an optimist; in other words, who was a precursor of the sentimentalist of the eighteenth century.—A unique copy of Bunyan's *Building, Nature, Excellency, and Government of the House of God*, a work believed lost, has been found at the University of St. Andrews.

Last year I called attention to the unscholarly nature of some of the *Broadway Translations*. Now in the same series there appears, advertised as if new, the *Memoirs of the Court of England in 1675* by Marie Catherine Baronne d'Aulnoy, "translated by Mrs. W. H. Arthur, edited and revised with notes by George David Gilbert." The words "and revised" are misleading, if not dishonest. On the reverse of the title-page there is found the confession: "First edition, 1913; second impression, 1927." This is indeed a mere reissue of the edition of 1913, on the title-page of which likewise appeared the assertion "and revised," signifying apparently that Gilbert had revised Mrs. Arthur's manuscript translation. The edition of 1913 itself was a typical exhibition of amateurishness, displaying a fond credulity, and naively declaring, "Mme. d'Aulnoy has a most undeserved reputation for inaccuracy. It will be seen that the notes corroborate every statement that she makes, even to tiny detail." The notes betray an inability to appreciate what constitutes sufficiency of evidence. In truth, to anyone versed in the narratives of this period it seems *prima facie* likely that the *Memoirs of the Court of England* is nothing else than an imaginative story exploiting notorious incidents, rumors, and characters of the Restoration period; i. e., it is a *chronique scandaleuse*, a form of prose fiction. To ignore this likelihood in 1913 was bad enough; to reissue in 1927 the work in a series which proclaims that "the editions shall be definitive," is outrageous. For in the meantime the suspicions regarding the fraudulent character of Mme. d'Aulnoy's narratives of this sort have grown stronger. In January, 1927, the erudite Hispanist, M. R. Foulché-Delbosc published his scholarly edition of Mme. d'Aulnoy's *Relation du Voyage d'Espagne*. In it he proved overwhelmingly that, although her assertions of the truth of her narrative are loud and long, she took her vivid Spanish scenes, incidents, and characters from the plays, novels, and letters of others, and that she had probably not even visited Spain! Had she visited England? Are the publishers of this edition warranted in advertising these *Memoirs* as "a valuable picture of Charles II's court"? The problem is of some importance, if only in its bearings on the methods of Defoe.

Substantial contributions have been made to Swift scholarship. Miss Marguerite Hearsey has demolished the argument which was

chiefly depended upon by those who doubted Berkeley's testimony that Swift married Stella. She demonstrates that Berkeley actually could have been told of the marriage, as he said he had been, and was not abroad at the time. She shows that the biographer of Berkeley made a mistake, regarding the date of Berkeley's foreign sojourn, in his first edition; and corrected it in his second (*PMLA.*, XLII, 157-161). It will be interesting to learn whether Miss Hearsey's discovery will modify the views of M. Pons, who in the first volume of his *Swift* (pp. 96, 119, 124) relies, like his predecessors, upon the first edition of Berkeley's *Life*.—Our knowledge of the history of the text of *Gulliver's Travels* is fortified by Harold Williams' definitive edition of the first edition, with a very important introduction.³ Elsewhere he discusses the *Canon of Swift* (*RES.*, III, 212-214). M. Emile Pons's school edition of *Gulliver* (Hachette) is superior to any English one of the kind in its introduction, bibliography, and notes. He discusses the language of the Lilliputians in the *Bulletin de Strasbourg* (v, 221). Lucius L. Hubbard, in a privately printed pamphlet, describes two Robinsonades published together in 1719: *James Dubourdieu*, which Swift may have borrowed details from; and *Alexander Vendchurch*, which recalls the controversy about *Krinke Kesmes* and Defoe.

The old error that Defoe wrote *The Storm* in prison has reappeared, not only in Lord Ernle's book, but also in G. D. H. Cole's edition of *A Tour Through Great Britain*, and in the Shakespeare Head Press *The Shortest Way*; but Dr. A. W. Secord has again refuted it.⁴

Mr. Bonamy Dobree provides a good introduction to the new translation of *The Sofa* by Crébillon, who certainly influenced Sterne, perhaps Smollett's *Memoirs of a Lady*, and probably other English novels. Mr. Dobree laments that English fiction lacks the subtle studies in "l'amour gout et l'amour passion" provided by Crébillon, Bibiéna, de la Morlière, de Boufflers, and the Marquis de Sade. Mr. Aldous Huxley, in *Essays New and Old*, characteristically praises Crébillon for his "complete absence of moral 'prejudices,'" and as "an expounder of the scientific truth about love—that its basis is physiological; that the intense and beautiful emotions which it arouses cannot be philosophically justified or explained, but should be gratefully accepted for what they are."

In the *History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia*, edited by R. W. Chapman, we have the most accurate account of the circumstances under which Johnson wrote the tale, and of the relation of the first six editions to each other. Another expression of Johnson's

³ *Gulliver's Travels: the text of the First Edition, with an Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes* (First Edition Club), 1926.—See the review by Emile Pons, *Revue Anglo-américaine*, v, 158-160.

⁴ *Times Literary Supplement*; January 26, 1928.

sense of the vanity of human wishes is given in his mournfully beautiful tale, *The Fountains*, nowadays too little read, and recently reprinted in the Baskerville Series.

The Shakespeare Head Edition of Sterne, in seven volumes, is the first complete one since Professor Cross's in 1904. A convenient issue in one volume of *The Sentimental Journey*, *The Journal to Eliza*, and the *Letters to Eliza*, has appeared in *Everyman's Library*, with an introduction by Professor Saintsbury, which learnedly (though none too clearly) sets forth some problems of Sterne's life and character. An admirable appreciation of Sterne, which appeared *à propos* of that edition in the *Times Literary Supplement* of May 26, led to a dispute in its columns concerning the authenticity of some of the letters published as Sterne's. Two books are preparing on this subject,—one by Miss Margaret R. B. Shaw, who regards the letters of 1740 as genuine; and one by Mr. Lewis P. Curtis of Yale, who thinks they were forged by Sterne's daughter, and who has also investigated those forged by Sterne's editor, William Combe.⁵ Until this problem is settled not only will such a careful edition as Mr. R. Brimley Johnson's *Letters of Sterne* be clouded by uncertainties, but the conduct of Yorick must remain dubious in significant respects.

A new edition has appeared of Mrs. Frances Sheridan's *History of Nourjahad*, an ingenious story with a crudely expressed moral.—Dr. Helen Scurr's thesis, *Henry Brooke*, contains a chapter on the novels, which is appreciative of their faults and merits rather than informative about their historical relationships. Its best feature is a succinct contrast between *The Fool of Quality* and the works of Rousseau.—In *The Anecdotes and Egotisms of Henry Mackenzie*, very well edited with a charming introduction by Professor H. W. Thompson, there is published for the first time a miscellany in which, among other interesting materials, appears an account of the circumstances under which *The Man of Feeling* was written. The volume contains notes on Sterne, Rousseau, and Roy Roy. A biography of Mackenzie, and an edition of *The Man of Feeling*, are soon to be issued by Professor Thompson.

William Godwin's *Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft* have been edited by Mr. W. Clark Durant. The text seems rather carefully reprinted from the first edition, and the variant readings of the second are noted. Blake's illustrations of Mary Wollstonecraft's stories, some of them rare, are reproduced. The rest of the volume, a supplement which Mr. Durant describes as "chronologically arranged, and containing hitherto unpublished or uncollected material," and which is much longer than the memoirs themselves, is a strange mass of materials, thrown together with little care, judgment, or plan. Its amateurish errors have been so sufficiently

* Cf. Clark, Edwin; in *New York Times Book Review*, January 15, 1928

chastised in the *Times Literary Supplement* for June 23rd, as to make it unnecessary to do more here than to warn against depending upon its records and assertions.

In the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1927, Mr. Michael Sadleir published a study of the seven "horrid" novels scornfully named in Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*, identified all but one of them, and made some suggestive generalizations concerning what he called the Gothistic epoch (1775-1815). Soon afterwards Robert Holden & Co. announced that the "Jane Austen Horrid Novels" would be republished with introductions by the Rev. Montague Summers; and the first two have appeared, *Horrid Mysteries*, a translation from the German by Karl Grosse; and *The Necromancer of the Black Forest*, which pretends to be by a German, and may be based on German lore.

We also have, in an unduly expensive volume of nearly four hundred large pages, *The Haunted Castle: a Study of the Elements of English Romanticism* (Routledge) by Eino Railo, who began his work under the guidance of Professor Yrjo Hirn of Helsinki University, Finland. The purpose of this book is "to serve as a guide to English horror-romanticism" from c. 1760 to c. 1840. Large portions of the volume deal with prose fiction. It begins with Horace Walpole, Clara Reeve, and Ann Radcliffe, describing the stage settings of their novels, and their typical landscapes, villains, tyrants, heroes, heroines, sentiments, etc. Next it presents in detail the life and works of 'Monk' Lewis; describes the haunted castle and similar properties in the novels of Scott, Shelley, and Maturin; and devotes separate chapters to the subsequent history of such features of Lewis' masterpiece as the criminal monk, the wandering Jew, the 'Byronic' hero, ghosts and demons, incest, etc. It ends with an analysis of the means by which the "terror-romantic" authors sought to evoke suspense and horror. The description of the contents and materials of the novels, some of them not well known, is often useful and praiseworthy, as is the pointing out of resemblances in themes; but of course what professes to be a piece of literary history must be something more than a description of successive phenomena.

The real merit of this ambitious work should be determined by comparing its actual achievement with its stated intentions. Postulating that the materials of which the haunted castle with its appurtenances and denizens is the center, constitute the essentials of "Horror-Romanticism," Dr. Railo pretends to set forth (1) the causes of the movement, (2) its rise, and (3) its influence. The third of these purposes,—specifically, the tracing of Lewis's influence upon later writers, or at least the recognition in later writers of similar themes,—has been well achieved. Indeed, in my opinion this would have been a much better book if it had been conceived as a monograph on the life, works, and influence of 'Monk' Lewis.

But the second of his purposes, the tracing of the development from Walpole to Radcliffe and Lewis, can hardly be said to have been perfectly attained because of the many gaps in his history. And in the first, and perhaps the most important, of his purposes,—the search for the origins and causes of the "horror-romantic" novel,—he fails utterly.

As Dr. Railo's extensive notes show, he is widely read in German studies of the romantic movement; and he knows a good deal at first hand concerning English and German romantic novels. Unfortunately, however, he is not well versed in the French prose fiction of the eighteenth century, a fatal weakness, since the immediate causes of the movement he is studying lie precisely there. The best he can do, in speculating upon the origins of the haunted castle is to refer to such remoter causes as Spenser and Shakespeare; and even in this connection he is unacquainted with the work that Miss C. F. McIntyre has done on that aspect of the matter. To perceive the fundamental weakness of his book, we must turn to an American study likewise published in 1927, Dr. James R. Foster's "The Abbé Prévost and the English Novel" (*PLMA.*, XLII, 443-64), which throws more light upon the origins of the Gothic novel than Dr. Railo's entire volume. Even though Dr. Railo was unable to profit by Professor Foster's study, he should have known Dr. B. M. Woodbridge's article upon the Abbé Prévost, published in 1911, or Étienne Servais' *Le Genre Romanesque en France*, published in 1922, either of which would have given him the clew to the historical causes and links which he was seeking. As Professor Foster brilliantly expounds, in what is the most valuable contribution to the study of eighteenth-century prose fiction made in 1927, even predecessors of Prévost had employed the "ghost haunted Gothic Chateau;" and it was Prévost who developed what Dr. Railo calls the "synthesis of horror romantic material" in many specific particulars. He has marvelous and moving adventures, the supernatural, portentious dreams, ruined castles and dungeons, ghosts, lugubrious and melancholy settings, and historical backgrounds, as well as types of character such as ominous priests, 'Byronic' heroes, and perfect innocents.⁶ Prévost or his French imitators were well known to writers like Sophia Lee, Clara Reeve, and Mrs. Radcliffe. In other words, the most important literary cause which Dr. Railo was seeking lay in the works of Prévost; and him he does not find.

He likewise overlooks the importance of Charlotte Smith, who before Mrs. Radcliffe and Lewis, wrote sentimental adventure

⁶ Another motif found in Prévost, and later to become important,—the rebellious assertion of the rights of love against the tyranny of social convention,—is pointed out by Dr. P. Van Tieghem in "Les Droits de l'Amour et l'Union Libre dans le Roman Français et Allemand (1760-1790)," *Necophilologus*, January, 1927, pp. 96-103.

stories furnished with landscapes, castles, and ghosts. He does not discuss Sophia Lee's *Recess*, a pseudo-historical novel in which the heroines are reared in a suite of rooms concealed in a ruined abbey and reached through sliding panels and trap doors leading to a subterranean passage. Her work, as Professor Foster shows, constitutes a link between Prévost and Mrs. Radcliffe. Another English novelist, who should have been considered in connection with romantic landscapes, Thomas Amory, is likewise neglected. In short, even when we grant Dr. Railo his premises (that the themes and materials are the important matter), he is not a satisfactory guide to their history before 'Monk' Lewis.

But should we grant that premise? I doubt it. I venture the opinion that the history of topics, of materials, used in literature, though perhaps ancillary, is not essentially the history of literature at all. Literature is a vision of life. The history of literature, though it must record what objective phenomena successive epochs used as materials, is primarily concerned with exhibiting the changing envisagements or interpretations of those materials from generation to generation. For example, what concerns the true historian is not so much that in the novels of both Walpole and Mrs. Radcliffe there are haunted castles as the really important fact that in Mrs. Radcliffe the supernatural is rationalistically explained away. In such significant distinctions Dr. Railo seems to take little interest. Hence I sympathize with the general tenor of Mr. Michael Sadleir's criticism of the book as "ponderous but trivial," although the word "trivial" too harshly ignores that Dr. Railo's materials may be very useful to later students. What is now needed is a philosophical history of the way in which the narrow domestic sentimentalism of Richardson developed into the broader and more adventurous sentimentalism of Prévost, and so onwards, almost by logical steps, to the complex and extravagant sentimentalism of the Gothic novelists.

A desirable supplement to Dr. Foster's study of Prévost is Dr. Tremaine McDowell's valuable article "Sensibility in the Eighteenth Century American Novel," which not only describes our early sentimental novels but also traces the English influences upon them.⁷ As one surveys the work, he is impressed by the fact that on the whole the contributions of greatest permanent value have been made in short articles rather than in books, and that the best work has been done by those who are in close contact with the present state of research in the whole field.

ERNEST BERNBAUM.

University of Illinois.

⁷ *Studies in Philology*, xxiv, 383-402.—The influence of the earlier novelists upon Irving's *Knickerbocker History* is set forth by Dr. McDowell and Dr. Stanley Williams in their excellent new edition of that classic.

The Road to Xanadu, A Study in the Ways of the Imagination.

By JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES. Boston and New York,
Houghton Mifflin, 1927. Pp. xviii + 639. \$6.00.

Although Professor Lowes's book on Coleridge has been out now for well over a year, and much of its material had already been set in more or less general circulation through his lectures, any attempt at a comprehensive review ought to bear the caption "First Glance." For the book does so many interesting things, and with such masses of pertinent detail, that perspective is not easy to attain even today. In what follows I wish simply to state some of the various contributions that the book seems to make—and that quite without reference to its professed purpose—and then to consider it briefly in relation to that purpose, venturing a suggestion or two as to what has been accomplished.

To begin at the wrong end: the notes, with the adequate index, form an admirable Coleridge encyclopaedia of a comprehensiveness that is a veritable marvel, considering the intensive focus of the study. Future students will undertake no piece of Coleridge research without using this volume as a reference work for bibliographical material, hints of sources, and miscellaneous details of fact and interpretation. The current interest in Coleridge means, of course, that some points in the notes are going to be significantly supplemented, and some of them modified; but they form an *opus magnum* of unquestionable importance.

Among the contributions of the text proper are some which the author specifically disavows as part of his intention. In spite of the disclaimer that stands at the close of the chapter, *The Bird and the Daemon* (p. 240), I believe that this, as well as every other chapter of the book, does add something to the beauty of the poetry on which it bears. Professor Lowes's accumulation of material from many far corners of the worlds that men have lived in physically and imaginatively has been carried to the point of a synthesis that sometimes reads almost like epic poetry; but more than this, it makes it impossible to re-read *The Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan* without finding that the beauty of their immediate appeal has been enhanced by the account of what went into their making.

Furthermore, while Professor Lowes was, as he said, interested in the imaginative process rather than in Coleridge's theory of the imagination, and while he has excluded, as he promised (p. x), "the nebulous theory propounded in the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of the *Biographia Literaria*," his book is nevertheless important for its incidental compilation of passages in which Coleridge has informally described the workings of the mind (e. g., pp. 55, 56, 61, 65, 72, 177, 192, 221, 327, 403). This compilation is differentiated from that of Mrs. Dodds, for instance, and is given unique value, by the fact that the psychological generalisations are used as

commentaries on psychological happenings that Professor Lowes has recounted in concrete detail. Consideration of these passages makes it evident that it was Coleridge the psychologist and critic as well as Coleridge the poet who insisted on accompanying the author in his work (cf. p. 434), and that he doubtless determined to a considerable extent the way in which the author imaged the imaginative processes that he was trying to describe.

And this leads, with many inexcusable omissions, to the book's professed purpose. It was not to be a conventional study of sources (p. 48); it was not to be, primarily, a study of Coleridge at all (p. 4); but rather a study of the imaginative process—a process peculiar to the poet only in degree (p. 59). Fundamentally, this is what it is. The interaction of the unconscious and the conscious, the spontaneous and the controlled, in the achievement of an imaginative work, is the reiterated theme of the book. The depths of the unconscious "are people to start out with . . . by conscious intellectual activity," and "it is again conscious energy, now of another and loftier type, which later drags the deeps for their submerged treasure, and moulds the bewildering chaos into unity" (p. 60). Between these two stages comes the "incessant activity of combination and amalgamation" (p. 63) of "the deep well of unconscious cerebration." These processes are common to all kinds of creative activity of all men, but in the case of the genius they are "superlatively enhanced." "The subliminal agencies are endowed with an extraordinary potency; the faculty which conceives and executes operates with sovereign power; and the two blend in untrammelled interplay" (pp. 431-2).

The development of this theme or hypothesis is especially commendable for the fact that the author used, as his material, objective and scientifically ascertained events—chiefly pertaining to Coleridge's reading as this was ingeniously traced, with his notebooks as a starting-point; and for the even more fundamental fact that he acknowledged that he was necessarily speaking in parables.

What is the value of the parable that he uses, of the way in which the imaginative process is imaged? It makes clear, as the author would have it, that the element of control in imaginative work need not be denied on the one hand nor explained in terms of mechanical calculation on the other. It enables him to show the organic function of design in *The Ancient Mariner* in unforgettable revealing terms. Yet, reading the book today, one realises that the science of psychology, and, what is more to the point, popular education as to the ways of the mind, have been progressing fast while Professor Lowes has been making his study. His formulations of issues occasionally suggest men of straw, and his generalizations occasionally sound as though they might have been taken for granted, even though his concrete contributions of material are fresh and stimulating in a high degree. Moreover, one of the real

psychological issues of the present moment centers on a point fundamental to Professor Lowes's choice of parables. In terms of this particular book it might be stated as follows: Does not the author's discussion of the conscious and the unconscious and their interrelations imply a mechanical conception incompatible with the organic notion that he is trying to instil? It is the perennial paradox of philosophy, of course. I can only put the question and refer to discussions by such diverse psychologists as Koffka and Watson for elucidation.¹ I believe that Professor Lowes's book went as far as the psychology current when he was shaping it would allow, and that it is doing much to make the best in that psychology more current and more concretely real; but I also believe that some of its psychological generalizations will have to be translated into other terms a little sooner than could have been anticipated even a few years ago. It is true that we are only beginning to get a vocabulary that will let us talk about, and think about, things that must be thought about more fully in connection with such a man as Coleridge: motor imagery (if we still allow imagery at all), muscular tension or strain, muscular tone, kinaesthetic images or sensations and such, as determining factors in the organic activity of imaginative creation. But we are beginning. And while it is inconceivable that we should ever get hold of such factors with anything like the definiteness with which we analyse out the visual imagery of a poem—and Heaven help us if we should! yet we may get far enough to realize a little better what does determine the behavior of the visual imagery. We may yet be able to carry the problem of art and artlessness in *Kubla Khan* a little nearer a solution than Professor Lowes has carried it (see note, pp. 567-9), and to re-image, with some modifications, the composition of a poem like *The Ancient Mariner*.

Meanwhile it must be kept in mind that Professor Lowes is offering for the psychologists material rather than conclusions (p. 344, note), and that he is himself urging the collection of supplementary material (p. xi). The book must not be considered as a more final statement than it ever intended to be. Taking it for what it actually is, designedly and fortuitously as well, one finds it affording enough to keep critics of Coleridge and other poets productively occupied for as long as they care to let it. And when its psychology has to be translated it will be found, I think, that it will bear translation.

ALICE D. SNYDER.

Vassar College.

¹ Cf. Koffka, *Structure of the Unconscious* (pp. 44-8) and Watson, *The Unconscious of the Behaviorist* (especially p. 93), in *The Unconscious, a Symposium*, ed. E. S. Dummer, Knopf, 1927. W. T. Thomas's *The Configurations of Personality* (*ib.*) uses *The Road to Xanadu*. See also C. F. Prescott's *Poetic Mind*, 1922, and Graham Wallas's *Art of Thought*, 1926.

t
s
t
d
e
e
s
r
s
t
l
l
e,
n
e
r
g
e
t
n
i
-